

The Classical Review

MAY, 1937

NOTES AND NEWS

LAST month the Classical Association for the first time held its Annual General Meeting out of England. It was invited by the Classical Society of Northern Ireland to meet in Belfast, and owes a deep debt of gratitude to the Society for a warm welcome, excellent hospitality, and admirable organization, and to the Irish scholars from Belfast and Dublin who gave a generous measure of their time and scholarship. Professor R. M. Henry delivered the Presidential Address on 'The Roman Tradition' and showed that, although the Roman tradition was a real thing, the heroization of early Romans was merely a pious belief much coloured by the influence of Greek philosophy. The other papers covered a wide range of subjects. Miss Eleanor Dobson discussed 'Birds and Beasts in Homer' with lantern illustrations. Euripides inspired two excellent papers, one on the *Hippolytus* by Professor Michael Tierney and one on the concluding scene of the *Phoenissae* by Professor H. O. Meredith. In the field of Roman literature, Professor W. Beare spoke on *contaminatio* in Plautus and Terence, Mr. W. F. J. Knight on 'Texture Patterns in Virgil', Mr. W. S. Maguinness on 'Horace and his Friends', and Professor E. H. Alton on 'Ovid in the Medieval Schoolroom'.

At the Business Meeting Dr. T. R. Glover was elected President. Emphasis was laid on the activities of two sub-committees of Council which are concerned with the teaching of Classics in schools.

Evening receptions were held by the Vice-Chancellor of the Queen's University and by the Classical Society of Northern Ireland. At the Informal Dinner on the last evening the speakers were Professor W. B. Anderson, Professor R. M. Henry, Professor J. F. Dobson and Professor W. A. Goligher. The programme also included visits to sites of

archaeological and historical interest in Northern Ireland. The Association is greatly indebted to Mr. L. J. Herring and Professor J. K. Charlesworth for their able direction of the expeditions to Co. Down and the Mourne Mountains and to Co. Antrim and the Giant's Causeway.

The death of Albert Curtis Clark on February 5 was a loss to many friends who loved his urbanity, his wit and his generous loyalty, and to a much wider circle of scholars who knew him through his works. He might be called a scholar of the transition age, for while his training at Haileybury, and at Balliol under de Paravicini, had given him the elegant taste and the literary feeling of the older generation, in the accuracy of his research he belonged to a more recent school. He was whimsical in his conversation, and there was an element of whim too in the successive enthusiasms of his undertakings in scholarship. When he first became a Fellow of Queen's his affections seemed to lie with Greek, and for some years he was famous for lectures on Theocritus. Then Cicero gripped him; he gave himself up to the study of the Ciceronian MSS., and between 1900 and 1911 produced the four volumes of Oxford texts which will remain the chief monument of his scholarship; they are characteristic both of the thoroughness of his detailed work and of the literary insight which makes a good editor. Cicero led him on into three other paths: the study of MSS. and MS. tradition which produced *The Descent of Manuscripts* in 1918; the close acquaintance with the scholars of the Renaissance which provided entertaining professorial lectures and the delightful address which he gave as President of the Classical Association in 1930; and the interest in the Cursus and the

Clausula, first fired by the work of Zieliński, which Clark introduced to England in the C.R. of 1905. This in its turn led to the study of the rhythm of ecclesiastical documents, which, combining with his permanent love of the vagaries of MSS., took him to his last passion for the Greek text of the New Testament. It was a disappointment to him that his edition of the *Acts of the Apostles*, in which he endeavoured to vindicate the Codex Bezae on the theory *lectio longior potior*, did not make more stir among the 'higher critics', for it was an almost greater undertaking than the Cicero text and he was himself profoundly convinced of the truth of his thesis. But he had fulfilled his natural bent and shown himself once more the true scholar who does not work to order but goes *ὅπη ἂν ὁ λόγος φέρῃ*.

Clark succeeded Robinson Ellis as Corpus Professor of Latin in 1913, and held the chair till failing health and eyesight brought about his resignation in 1934. If he did not make it his task to foster research among Oxford dons, he was always ready to help with advice and encouragement; to hear him talk on one of the subjects he had made his own was in itself an education in scholarship. He was a good common-room man and could easily have taken his place at table with Cicero and Atticus, or with Poggio and his friends, sipping his wine critically and discoursing *φιλόλογα multa*. He was a scholar who belonged not to his own age only, and the influence, which he never consciously sought, will last.

What the C.R. owes to Clark appears not only from its indexes but also from its title-pages. He was a member of the Classical Journals Board in 1915, its Secretary in 1918, its Treasurer from 1922 to 1928; and a member of it still, though *rude donatus*, until 1933.

The unhappy death of Wallace Martin Lindsay removed the last of a trio of British Latinists whose work was known far beyond their own country. He went to St. Andrews with a reputation already established; he held his chair for close on forty years, and for twenty-five he and Burnet

made a pair which upheld the name of St. Andrews, and of Scotland, throughout the learned world. His work on philology, on palaeography, on the text and verse of the Latin comedians, on the grammarians and the glossaries, needs no encomium. What was most remarkable in him was that an infinite capacity for drudgery was combined with a happy-go-lucky enthusiasm which enlivened all he did and kept him very young. It was characteristic of Housman to think that certain 'derivative words' of his echoed for ever in Lindsay's memory; it was characteristic of Lindsay that they did not. When he saw, or was told, that he had been wrong, his composure was never shaken, and he gaily set about trying again; it is no detraction from his merit to say that he was sometimes writing out of sheer mischief with his tongue in his cheek, just to see 'how they would take it.' He was known to mark Latin proses at an International, and all his days he found the Cairngorms a powerful counter-attraction to examiners' meetings. Rarely has such colossal industry gone with so light a heart.

The Fifth International Congress of Papyrology will open on August 30 and close on September 3. The choice of Oxford as the place of meeting is a fit tribute to the memories of Grenfell and Hunt. Scholars who wish to read papers (for which the normal time-limit is twenty minutes) are asked to send titles and summaries to Mr C. H. Roberts at St John's College, Oxford.

Klassieke Bibliographie, which has now reached its eighth year, may be had either in the form of paper slips, issued in monthly batches for classical articles and periodicals and quarterly for classical books, or as a bound volume in which the same items are printed consecutively, with indexes of authors and subjects appended. Reviews are not recorded. The compilation is based on the intake of the Buma and certain other Dutch libraries; this no doubt explains why the 1936 volume contains a number of books published in 1934

and
peri
Vina
book
Allan
Scot
To t
relia
(193
eleve
mer
Of t
whic
two
still
mate
artic
unde

1295

1300

1305

So
MSS.
tion o
to Or
of L,
'nunq
illa, u
statem
Nor is
excuse
raises
shoul
the go
that m
Electr
tween
end of
of the
dress t

1 Pre

and many of 1935, and why some periodicals (e.g. *Emerita*, *Comment. Vindob.*) and a number of important books (to take a few English examples, Allan's *De Caelo*, Jenkins's *Dedolica*, Scott's *Hermetica* IV) are not included. To these limitations must be added unreliability of 'dépouillement'. C.R. L (1936) contains twenty-five articles and eleven shorter notes: thirteen of the former and all of the latter are unrecorded. Of the articles in C.R. XLIX (1935) which were omitted in the 1935 volume, two are here included but three are still missing. Nor is the editing of the material above criticism. Mr. Tate's article in C.R. L 3 is misclassified under 'Atheismus', and the index com-

bines Messrs. D. J. and J. Allan into one person. Zeno is called Eleatus in the text, Eleastus in the index; 'Equus Troiae' is an odd piece of Latin, and 'Dialectus Italicae' is even odder. The heading 'Ars Metrica' is given to eight items but denied to three others which have as good a claim to it, and anyone who is interested in an article on 'Ptolemy's Zoo' is unlikely to look for it under 'Vivarium'. For further particulars of the volume see below (p. 95).

Les Etudes classiques continues its bibliographies of Greek authors (see C.R. L, 161). The January number deals with Herodotus, the April number with Demosthenes and Aeschines.

EURIPIDES, *ELECTRA* 1292-1307.

- 1295 Xο. ὦ παῖδε Δίος, θέμεις ἐς φθογῆς
τὰς ὑμετέρας ἡμῖν πελάθειν;
Δι. θέμεις, οὐ μυσταρεῖς τοῖσδε σφαγίοις.
1295 Ηλ. κάμοι μύθον μέτα, Τυνδαρίδαι;
Δι. καὶ σὺ. Φοῖβη τήνδ' ἀναθήσω
πράξιν φονίαν.
Xο. πῶς ὄντε θεῷ τήσδε τ' ἀδελφῷ
τῆς καπθιμένης
1300 οὐκ ἠρκέσατον κῆρας μελάρους;
Δι. μοῖρά τ' ἀνάγκης ἦγ' ἢ τὸ χρεῶν,
Φοῖβου τ' ἀσοφοῦ γλώσσης ἐνοπαῖ.
Ηλ. τίς δ' ἐμ' Ἀπόλλων, ποῖοι χρησμοὶ
φονίαν ἔδωσαν μητρὶ γενέσθαι;
1305 Δι. κοιναὶ πράξεις, κοῖνοι δὲ πόντοι,
μία δ' ἀμφοτέρους
ἀπὸ πατέρων δίκνασεν.

So runs Murray's text. But the MSS. are not agreed about the attribution of 1295: L gives it to Electra, P to Orestes. Murray decides in favour of L, and adds the following note: 'nunquam adloquitur Orestes deos; illa, ut solet, audacior est.' The latter statement is true, but not conclusive. Nor is it at all clear how Phoebus can excuse Electra, and in fact she herself raises the point at 1303 f. Why then should the question of the Chorus and the gods' answer¹ be interposed? For that matter, why should the question of Electra (or Orestes) be interposed between 1292 ff. and 1298 ff.? At the end of the gods' long speech the leader of the Chorus asks permission to address them simply in order that, in the

part of *enfant terrible*, she may ask her very awkward question;² when she has received an answer of sorts, she is silent till the closing lines of the play.

I would suggest therefore the transposition of 1295-1297 after 1302 and the attribution of 1295 to Orestes (with P.) This gives a more lucid progression of ideas. The leader of the Chorus asks permission to speak; it is granted. She asks her question, receives her reply, and is then silent, while Electra, Orestes, and the Dioscuri hold the stage. Not discouraged by 1294, Orestes then asks if he too may speak. The Dioscuri change their mind; their own mention of Apollo at 1302³ gives them an excuse for backing out of the implications of 1294; Orestes may speak, for they will impute his bloody deed to Phoebus. But, says Electra, how do Apollo and his oracles justify her matricide (cf. 1224 ff.)? It is another awkward question, and the gods, at pains for an answer, fall back upon fate,⁴ ἀπὸ πατέρων, which, in realistic terms, is that complex of heredity and environment whose working upon the char-

¹ I.e., that question is not suggested merely by Τυνδαρίδαι (1295).

² Itself prepared by 1245 f.

³ Prepared by 1301, as their reply to Orestes by 1302. Cf. also 1248.

⁴ Presumably it is Castor alone who speaks.

acters Euripides has been expounding throughout the play.

There are two possible objections to this procedure. First, Orestes, after asking and receiving permission to speak, says nothing. This objection is simply answered: he does not get a chance, for Electra (ut solet, audacior) interposes. It is idle to enquire what he had in mind to ask. For that matter, even if the question is Electra's, it arises out of what the gods say and reveals no antecedent query in her mind. Secondly, it may be objected that lucidity was not here the poet's object, but rather to bombard the embarrassed gods with questions from two women who will not wait for one another.¹ This must be answered at further length.

There is clearly an inconsistency between 1294, with its impressive moral frown, and 1296, which with its second thoughts quite destroys the effect of 1294. This is of the intention of the poet, who treats the Dioscuri satirically in this highly satirical play. But, as the lines stand, the clash comes too soon, is too crude; and Orestes is needed as a step in the argument. Transpose the lines, and they are given a little time to save their faces; give 1295 to Orestes, and they retreat by

stages from their high moral position. May the Chorus speak? Yes, because they are not polluted. May Orestes? Yes, because of Apollo. May Electra? Yes, because of . . . fate, ἀτὴ πατέρων. Their original position has completely disintegrated. But Orestes is not merely a step in this rather schematic progression: he is also a necessary psychological link, in the following way. In the gods' long speech Electra is regarded only as something to be given to Pylades²: Πυλάδῃ μὲν Ἠλέκτραν δὸς ἄλοχον ἐς δόμους (1249), Πυλάδης μὲν οὖν κόρην τε καὶ δάμαρτ' ἔχων (1284). That is all. It is thus a violent and improbable leap to make them answer her (supposed) question at 1295 so glibly with the far-fetched excuse of Phoebus. Rather it needs the intermediate link of Orestes and Apollo and her question arising out of it to make the Dioscuri face her problem at all.

Finally, it may be noted that by this rearrangement *φονίαν* (1297) and *φονίαν* (1304) are brought into immediate relation, and that *κοιναί, κοινοί, ἀμφοτέρους* in 1305 ff. almost demand a recent reference to Orestes.

R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM.

Birkbeck College, London.

¹ I am indebted to Professor D. S. Robertson for this suggestion.

² In effect a *δῆμας*, as Orestes says at 1341: cf. also 15, 20, 44, and the whole psychology of Electra.

THE APPEARANCE OF CHARON IN THE FROGS.

THE words of Dionysos in *Frogs* 180, *χωρῶμεν ἐπὶ τὸ πλοῖον*, mark the change to a new scene, that in which Charon, his boat, and the infernal flood, were all represented. The nature of that change cannot be exactly determined. It was long thought to have been effected by turning the *περίακτος*, and Cockerell, cited by Mitchell, considered that a real boat was revealed at this point, floating in a trough at the back of the *λογεῖον*. These explanations entail insuperable mechanical difficulties, and make Charon's *ὥπ παραβαλοῦ*, which follows so closely upon Dionysos' remark that it is made to complete it metrically, both unnecessary and meaningless. For the words must refer to a boat coming in to

land (Schol. on *Birds* 1395: *κέλευσμά ἐστι τὸ ὥπ τῶν ἐρεσσόντων καταπαύον τὴν κωπηλασίαν*). If the boat were merely revealed in position, the words would be totally out of place.

It must therefore be assumed, as more recent editors of the play have assumed, that a boat actually appeared on the stage. But the manner of its appearance is left undiscussed. Tucker suggests that the boat 'enters the orchestra on rollers'; Radermacher declares: 'alsbald (i.e. directly after Dionysos' remark) schiebt sich, wahrscheinlich im Rücken der beiden Helden, ein carrus navalis auf die Bühne'. But even in modern times the stage boat is clumsy to handle, and in Athenian times it can have been

no e
flim
The
Dio
the
late
alon
Cha
poss
T
βαλ
expl
fact
them
row
men
at le
ligio
he is
boat
boat
and
same
wher
in C
τῆς κ
μόνος
Men.
only
assur
it ba
warr
and
Trad
not l
tradi
journ
waiti
pole
how l

PROP
return
Its i
perha
face v
mistr
elegia
satiric
a still
The
poem,
editor
Prope

no easy task to haul a boat, of however flimsy construction, on to the stage. The situation, then, is this: when Dionysos says 'let us go and look for the boat' (as Radermacher rightly translates) the two travellers begin to move along the stage, and at the same moment Charon's boat is dragged into view, possibly behind them.

The words which follow, ὥπ παραβαλοῦ, may now be discussed. The explanations of them are all unsatisfactory. Radermacher would address them to a crew. That Charon did not row his own boat we know from a fragment of sixth-century pottery, described at length by Furtwängler (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 1905, p. 191), in which he is shown seated in the stern of his boat, holding the steering-paddles. The boat is fitted for at least ten pairs of oars, and is being rowed by εἰδῶλα. This same fact we find explicitly in Lucian, where Menippus describes his passage in Charon's boat: καὶ γὰρ ἤντησα καὶ τῆς κόπης συνελαβόμεν καὶ οὐκ ἔκλαον μόνος τῶν ἐπιβατῶν (*Dial. Mort.* 22; cp. *Men.* 10, *Dial. Mort.* 10). But the εἰδῶλα only rowed the boat one way, and to assume a permanent crew who rowed it back from the further shore is unwarrantable on the evidence we possess, and unlikely on mythological grounds. Tradition is rarely logical, and it need not be assumed that there was any tradition at all for Charon's return journey. He was always thought of as waiting on the shore to ferry the souls, pole in hand, and no one enquired how he had come there.

Aristophanes might indeed have represented Charon sitting at his oars as a piece of humorous incongruity, in view of the traditional conception of him. Tucker takes this view, and explains the words ὥπ παραβαλοῦ as having been shouted by Charon at himself as he tugged at the oars. But this is not happy. παραβαλοῦ is a definite command; probably, as all but Radermacher understand it, 'lay her to'. To whom, then, was it addressed? In *Peace* 175 we have an explicit reference to a stage engineer, and the idea would not have seemed outrageous to an Athenian audience. If we assume Charon to be shouting at his scene-shifters in the present passage, the difficulties attending it disappear. Aristophanes was a little alarmed by the clumsiness of the stage boat, as he was by that of the stage beetle in the *Peace*, and so he turned it into a joke. Charon stands in his traditional position at the stern of the boat, paddle in hand, and directs the operations, while his boat is hauled up on to the stage.

The only difficulty is that of explaining the subsequent transit of the boat, but it is only an apparent difficulty. The scene-shifters were still there, but Aristophanes did not think it necessary to continue apologizing for them. The only jokes he consistently repeats are those which have been hallowed by generations of service.

A. L. M. CARY.

Trinity College, Oxford.

AN INTERPRETATION OF PROPERTIUS IV, 7.

PROPERTIUS' description of Cynthia's return from the grave is a curious poem. Its incongruities suggest that it was perhaps not intended to be taken at its face value as a lament for his dead mistress, phrased in the conventional elegiac manner. Can it have been a satirical comment on the character of a still quite vigorous Cynthia?

The most startling feature of the poem, commented upon by nearly all editors, is its juxtaposition to one of Propertius' more lively efforts. In the

eighth elegy of Book IV he tells how Cynthia caught him in somewhat compromising circumstances, and describes her furious rage. In spite of his assurance that she was *furibunda decens* she can hardly be considered, on this occasion, a pleasing figure. If the traditional order of the poems is authentic, it argues either bad taste or lack of sensibility on the part of the poet to have put this scene, with its broad humour and its mock-heroic exaggeration, next to a poem on Cynthia's death. Neither

failing is conspicuous elsewhere in his works, and even a later editor would scarcely have been so obtuse. We may then assume that the arrangement was intentional and significant.

One feature is common to both poems. Cynthia's temper, so well portrayed in IV, 8, and familiar from many earlier scenes, is represented as having suffered little change in death. Throughout most of the eighty-one lines of her speech in IV, 7 she berates Propertius for the speed with which he has forgotten her, and for the lack of ceremony with which he conducted her funeral. She demands the punishment of the slaves whom she believes guilty of her death, and departs, reminding him that, though other women may have him while he lives, in death he will be hers:

mecum eris et mixtis ossibus ossa teram.

There is a ghoulish touch about the last phrase, singularly out of place in the mouth of one patiently awaiting her lover's arrival in the Elysian fields.

The technique of IV, 7 is not unlike that of I, 3. In the latter poem we have thirty-four lines of exquisite description leading up to Cynthia's speech. They give us a really touching picture of Propertius, not quite steady on his feet and obviously in a very impressionable state, as he stands in the moonlight by his mistress' bed, trembling lest his lightest touch may waken her:

expertae metuens iurgia saevitiae.

He was not disappointed. Her greeting, when the moonlight shining on her eyes has roused her and she props herself on her elbow to address him, is a horrid anticlimax:

Tandem te nostro referens iniuria lecto
alterius clausis expulit e foribus?

We experience the same abrupt change of atmosphere when Cynthia speaks in IV, 7. The description of her appearance, her burned clothing and withered lips, might be merely symptoms of a morbid imagination, but when she shakes her dead hand at him till the bony fingers rattle, and bursts out,

Perfide, nec cuiquam melior sperande puellae,

it is plain that this is no ordinary ghost. It must have been a sore trial to Cynthia that her immaterial state

deprived her of her former privilege of scratching his face. There is about her none of the tenderness of the spectral Creusa, nor even the decent reticence of Dido under somewhat similar circumstances. Indeed Propertius has warned us that we are to expect something unusual. The 'at' in line 11 points the contrast between Cynthia's supernatural character and her very earthy words.

We see then that this poem is not the conventional meeting between a bereaved lover and the spirit of his mistress which has returned to console him. There is no note of genuine sorrow or affection. The gentler emotions were not in Cynthia's repertoire. It was apparently her very vitality that fascinated Propertius. After one stormy scene he says (III, 8, 33):

aut tecum aut pro te mihi cum rivalibus arma
semper erunt: in te pax mihi nulla placet.

He seems to have interpreted her rages as a sign of jealous love and to have been willing to endure them as such. Even so, however, the nervous strain of life with Cynthia must have been considerable, and, while Propertius had not Tibullus' love of submission,¹ neither had he the temperament and the gift for invective that would have made Catullus a match for her. I suspect that it was this rather than her infidelity that led to their final separation. Several times in fact he refers to her other affairs and says that when her other lovers leave her she will still find him faithful.² There is no word of reproach on this score in the two poems in which he apparently made the break.³ His chief direct accusation is

tu bene conveniens non sinis ire iugum.⁴

After the break had been made, only two more poems are concerned with Cynthia: IV, 7 and 8. Both show her violent temper. I should like to take them as attempts to justify his decision to leave her. In this case how is IV, 7 to be interpreted? I would suggest that it provides no evidence of Cynthia's death. Its whole sardonic tone seems

¹ Cf. I, 5, 30: at iuvat in tota me nihil esse domo.

² II, 21; 24 B; III, 20 A.

³ III, 24; 25.

⁴ III, 25, 8.

rather to prove that she was alive at the time and perhaps reproaching Propertius for his behaviour. It says simply 'Death itself could not soften Cynthia's tongue. Even if she died and came back to me from Hades, it would be the same old story.' The setting is conventional, as is most of the terminology. The last scene, in which the vindictive shade, having delivered her last threat, flits from his dutifully attempted embrace, is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the usual phrase, such as

ter frustra comprehensa manus effugit imago.

The opening words of the poem, moreover, should warn us against taking it at its face value. Just as Catullus in his last poem to Lesbia echoes his first, so here 'Sunt igitur Manes' seems to recall cynically the burst of joy in I, 8, which begins

Sunt igitur Musae, neque amanti tardus Apollo,
quis ego fretus amo: Cynthia rara mea est.

AGNES KIRSOPP LAKE.

Bryn Mawr College.

JUVENAL i. 81-89.

JUVENAL has told us why he will write satire, and now he sets to work.

'Since the rains uplifted the sea, and Deucalion took ship uphill and asked for oracles, when little by little stones grew soft and warm with the breath of life, and Pyrrha showed naked girls to the eyes of men, when was there a richer crop of sin? When were the pockets of avarice wider agape? When was gambling so much agog?'¹

Pyrrha marks the beginning of vice, as in xv. 30 she marks the beginning of crime. Never since the Flood was vice so rife as now.

My version omits two lines and a syllable:—

Ex quo Deucalion nimbis tollentibus aequor
naugio montem ascendit sortesque poposcit
paulatimque anima caluerunt mollia saxa
et maribus nudas ostendit Pyrrha puellas,
quidquid agunt homines, uotum, timor, ira,
uoluptas,
gaudia, discursus, nostri farrago libelli est.
et quando uberior uitiorum copia? quando
maior auaritiae patuit sinus? alea quando
hos animos?

Good and famous as the two lines are, I believe them to be out of place. They are in any case a strange description of Juvenal's matter. He is not a Balzac or a Dickens, but a man who looks for choice at the seamy side of life. Not prayers, fear, anger, pleasure, joys, and bustle are his theme, but selfish prayers, craven fear, wild anger, unwholesome pleasure, illicit joys, and feverish bustle. In some place or other, however, he might conceivably have summed up his matter in these words; but surely not here.

Include the two lines, and they supply the main clause to the dependent clauses which precede; and the purport of the whole sentence is, that his theme is all the doings of mankind since the Flood. Not so: his theme is the vices and follies of his day. Omit the two lines, and the 'since' of the dependent clauses is correlative to the temporal interrogatives of the rhetorical questions, and all is well.

If the two lines are out of place, how came they here, and what is to be done with the syllable *et*?

For *et quando* read *ecquando*. In minuscule manuscripts of Latin authors *c* and *t* are often confused, and, in particular, the prefix *ec* fares very ill, being commonly corrupted into *h(a)ec* or *et*. In Livy V. lii. 1, for example, *ecquid* appears under the disguises *aecquid*, *haec quid*, *et quid*, *nec quid*.

Of the three questions the first will then begin with *ecquando*, the second and third with *quando*. In Cicero *pro Sestio* 110 we have the series *ecquae . . . ? ecqui . . . ? ecquae . . . ? cui . . . ?*

The text of Juvenal contains many spurious lines, or lines out of place; some worthy of Juvenal, some unworthy.¹ The two lines which we are

¹ See Housman's preface, pp. xxxi ff. This paper was read to the Cambridge Philological Society in 1920 (see *Cambridge University Reporter*, 1920-1, p. 444, and the Society's *Proceedings*, CXV-CXVII, p. 13). Housman was present and did not dissent either then or later, when we spoke about it; but in his edition of 1931 he says nothing on the subject one way or the other.

considering are worthy of him, but they do not fit their present place. Whence they came, and by what accident or

design they were inserted here, I cannot say. E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

NOTES ON THE MULOMEDICINA CHIRONIS.

THE *Mulomedicina Chironis*, written about A.D. 400 by a man who knew more about horses than about the niceties of Latin grammar, is one of the most important documents for the gradual transformation of Latin. Its value in this respect, however, is greatly diminished by the appalling state of the tradition. Preserved in one badly written ms. of the fifteenth century (M), which was discovered by W. Meyer in the Munich library in 1885, the text was edited by E. Oder for the Bibliotheca Teubneriana in 1901. This edition truly deserved the praise which it received from all quarters; fitted for the purpose by an admirable knowledge of ancient veterinary medicine, and helped by the critical sagacity of Buecheler and others, Oder solved innumerable riddles and succeeded in presenting an almost readable text. Yet eight pages of *Addenda et Corrigenenda* bore witness how much there still remained to be done, and in the last thirty-five years H. Ahlquist, S. Grevander, W. Heraeus, K. Hoppe, E. Löfstedt and M. Niedermann have proposed scores of excellent emendations; at the same time many readings of the ms. which had been altered by Oder have found defenders who showed that what seemed to be a scribe's mistake was in harmony with the development of the language. Justified though these attempts in general may be, I frequently notice a tendency to overrate the reliability of our ms. E.g. (p. 164, 21), *simul fit tremidus totius corporis* (sc. *equus*) is recorded as a remarkable use of the genitive with an adjective; but one has to keep in mind that the ms. freely interchanges *d* and *t*, and thus, comparing (*ibid.* 29) *tremor omnium musculorum* . . . *superveniāt*, I prefer to find here, instead of the rare adjective *tremidus*, a hitherto unknown noun *tremitus* = *tremor* (cf. *fremitus* etc.), very likely the ancestor of Italian *tremito*. Again, the odd construction (p. 189, 4)

si . . . , haec remediare 'if . . . , use the following remedies' is passed as correct, whereas, as is shown by the occurrence of the same phrase p. 18, 18 and 194, 24, we should read *haec remedia erunt*.

But instead of picking examples of M's faults from different places, I propose to turn to one single passage in order to show what, both by correcting M and by following it more closely than Oder did, a future edition of the *Mulomedicina* should achieve.

(Oder p. 241, 10 ff.) *dentes sic cognoscis. equus male praenatus si erit, (11) primos deiciet dentes annorum duum et mensium sex, et (12) tunc nascuntur ei colomellares. sed si in annis continuis (13) duobus et mensibus sex dentierint, optimi equi sunt, us(14)que in annos octo. postea rumpunt dentes, et apparent (15) brumatici, et fiunt salebrosi et tunc senescunt in aliis an(16)nis VIII. sed vivere possunt usque in annos numero 24^{or}. (17) equus bene praenatus si erit, primos deiciet dentes (18) post annos duos, et secundos alios post annum. deinde (19) interiit annum et nascuntur ei colomellares, omnes dentes (20) compleminales annis duobus et mensibus decem. sunt qui (21) equi addunt sibi usque ad annos VIII. sed optimi sunt (22) usque ad annos X. deinde strophosi fiunt et acutiores et (23) breviores. usque in annos X optime uteris. postea (24) senescunt in aliis annis XII.*

10 fuerit || 15 brumatici = brocchi | salibosi || 16 hibern sic, vivere in marg. || 17 pedatus || 19 interiit = intericit (i.e. intericitur) || 20 sunt B(uuecheler): si ||.

10: *praenatus*, here and in 17, according to Oder is the same as *prognatus*; but in 17 the ms. has *pedatus*, and the *Hippiatrica Graeca* (edd. Oder-Hoppe I p. 324, 11 f.) speak of *μαλακόπους* and *στερεόπους*; consequently we must write *pedatus* in both places. *male pedatus* for *μαλακόπους* may be an attempt to imitate the sounds of the Greek expression, a phenomenon well

known from late Latin translations; the opposite, *bene pedatus*, would follow automatically. In other passages, however, the *Hippiatrica* use *κακόπους*.

13: *optimi equi sunt usque in annos octo* (no comma) means ἀκμάζουσιν εἰς ἔτη ὀκτώ; cf. *Hipp.* p. 324, 11.

15: *brumatici* is recorded in the *Thesaurus* (with an interrogation mark) as a different word from Isidore's *brumaticus*; it is, of course, nothing but a corruption of *reumatici*; cf. *Hipp.* p. 325, 4 ff.: ῥήγγνται ὁ ὁδούς . . . καὶ τότε μάλιστα ρεύμα ἐπιπίπτει εἰς τὸ στόμα τῶν ἵππων. For *salebrosi* read *salibosi* (= *salivosi*) with the ms.; cf. 195, 28 *reumatici autem et hi sunt quibus salivae fluunt de ore*; this confirms *reumatici*.

18: For *alios* we should probably read *alium*; cf. 15 and 24 in *aliis annis*.

19: *interiit annum*. Ahlquist regards *annum* as *accus. temporis pro subiecto*, and Löfstedt points out two parallels for this in the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (p. 297 of his commentary); nevertheless I think it possible that Oder's explanation, = *intericit* (not, however, = *in-*

tericitur) is correct; the subject is the horse, and the construction thus resembles (e.g.) *Hipp.* p. 324, 20 μῆνας ὀκτώ διαλιπόντες.

20: *compleminales*, a beautiful word, has been perpetuated in the *Thesaurus*; put a stop after *colomellares* and read *complent in aliis*. As for *annis duobus et mensibus decem*, we need hardly say that this is one of the numerous mistakes on the part of the translator; the intervals are usually given in years or half-years; he has misunderstood *δυοκαίδεκα* or rather *δυσὶ καὶ δέκα*, which is the reading of the Paris ms. in *Hipp.* p. 324, 3 f.: ἐτέροις δὲ μῆσι δυοκαίδεκα τὸν καταρτισμὸν φύει. It appears that Grevander's statement (*Eranos* 26, p. 102) that the translator followed the Berlin version rather than the Paris version will have to be modified. Finally, *sunt* should be rejected and *M's si* restored; the parallel of 12 ff. *si . . .*, *optimi equi sunt* leaves hardly any doubt that in 21 *sed* must be done away with, although there is no apparent reason for its intrusion.

OTTO SKUTSCH.

St. Andrews.

TWO NOTES.

PINDAR *Ol.* X 76: αἰδετο δὲ πᾶν τέμενος κ.τ.λ. Commentators cite no good parallel to this description of a place ringing with the sound of the human voice. One is provided, if the supplement is correct, by Eurip. *Antiope* fr. 1. 27 (von Arnim, *Suppl. Eurip.* p. 20) ἀλαλδ-ζε[ται στέ]γα.

[THEOCRITUS] XXI 44 f.:

καὶ γὰρ ἐν ὕπνοις
πᾶσα κύων ἄρτον μαντεύεται, ἰχθῦα κάγων.

Ahrens, followed by Cholmeley, could not believe that a dog might dream of bread, and therefore read ἄρκτον. Whatever may be the merits of this excursion into canine psychology, it would be hard to believe that 'every' Greek dog had any immediate reason for dreaming of 'bear'. The hungry fisherman of the poem dreams of his usual fare. The Greek¹ dog probably knew less of bear than of bread.² There was at least one dog which might well

have dreamed of bread; see Diphilus *fr.* 91 (Kock *Com. Att. fragm.* II p. 571) with its description of the αἰσχρὰ γυνή whom

ὁ πατὴρ ἐφίλησεν οὐδὲ πώποτε·
παρ' ἧς τὸν ἄρτον ἡ κύων οὐ λαμβάνει,
μέλαινα δ' οὕτως ὥστε καὶ ποιεῖν σκότος.

J. F. LOCKWOOD.

University College, London.

TWO NOTES ON THE BACCHAE.

πρὸς φάτναις δὲ ταῦρον εὐρών, οὐ καθεῖρε' ἡμᾶς ἄγων,
τῷδε περὶ βρόχους ἐβαλλε γόνασι καὶ χηλαῖς ποδῶν,
θυμὸν ἐκπνέων, ἰδρῶτα σώματος ἐτάζων ἀπο,
χείλεσιν διδοὺς ὀδόντας. 618 ff.

'BITING his lips' is the usual rendering. But a man who like Pentheus in this passage is pulling violently on a rope or cord would, I think, carefully avoid doing anything of the kind.

The true sense of διδοὺς is rather 'offering, exhibiting, showing his teeth': Pentheus' lips are drawn back; he snarls in his fierce effort.

λαβοῦσα δ' ὠλένας ἀριστερὰν χεῖρα 1125

So reads our only MS., and most editors follow. The sense is clear enough: Agave caught hold of Pentheus' arm. But is the reading correct?

¹ If this poem came from Alexandria, it is perhaps worth recalling that Hecataeus described the Egyptians as ἀροφάγοι (Athen. X p. 418E).

² At a much later date Demetrius Constant. in his *κινουσόφιον* § 29 (εἰς πτωχάναντα εἰ παχύναι θέλεις) gives the following instruction: τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἄρτον αὐτῷ μετὰ γάλακτος δίδου ὅσον ἐσθίεν εἰωθεῖν.

Prinz-Wecklein quote Minervini as suggesting

λαβοῦσα δ' ὠλένην ἀριστερὰν χερί,

and themselves propose

ἀλλ' ὠλένην λαβοῦσ' ἀριστερὰν χερί,

which last affords at any rate a quasi-caesura, but is rather a long way from the MS. Both these suggestions give to *χερὶ* and *ὠλένη* their normal senses of 'hand' and 'arm' respectively: the MS. reverses these.

The Oxford text reads (with Kirchhoff)

λαβοῦσα δ' ὠλένης ἀριστερὰν χέρα,

which does not satisfy me; nor does it the editor, who himself proposes

- (a) λαβοῦσα χεῖρα δ' ὠλένης ἀριστερὰν,
(b) ἀλλ' ὠλένης λαβοῦσα χεῖρ' ἀριστερὰν.

These do not help much: none of them is really clear, and (a) and (b) are again far from the MS.

I believe that Minervini's suggestion, with one small change, may yield the right reading. He offers

λαβοῦσα δ' ὠλένην ἀριστερὰν χερί.

Read rather *χεροῖν*.

The difficulty about caesura—if it is a difficulty—remains. But

1. We get rid of the trouble caused by *ὠλένη hand* in juxtaposition with *χερὶ arm*. This is, I think, vital in this passage.

2. We now have an accurate description of the physical event described. What Agave does she does by miracle: it would be impossible to human strength. But though miracle is here affirmed, even the miraculous must observe 'economy'. Agave, miraculously aided, may tear Pentheus' arm clean off. But she must not do it with *one hand*. She does what anyone would do in like case: she seizes Pentheus by the *arm* with *both her hands*, sets her foot against his side to get a purchase, and so tears the whole arm from the shoulder.

This reading gives a clear and natural sense; it is reasonably close to the MS.; and it draws strong support from the *χεροῖν* of 1128.

W. W. C. DUNLOP.

Codrington College, Barbados.

THE USE OF OIL IN WEAVING.

THERE are two references in Homer to the use of oil in weaving linen:¹ at *Od.* vii. 107 the maidens in the palace of Alcinoüs are weaving 'and from the close-woven linen the liquid oil runs off', and at *Il.* xviii. 596 the youths in the dancing-place on the shield of Achilles are clothed in linen tunics 'well spun, shining softly with oil'.

An inquiry addressed to the Research Institute of the Linen Industry Research Association at Lambeg in Northern Ireland elicited a very courteous reply from the Director, Dr W. H. Gibson, who says that from the scientific and technical standpoint the use of oil in weaving linen yarn is in line with the most modern practice when a closely woven cloth is required. In ancient Greece the yarn would probably be woven in the grey, or raw unboiled state, and so would be hard or harsh and difficult to work. Treating the weft yarn with oil would soften and lubricate the yarn, enabling a greater number of shots of weft to be inserted in an inch of cloth, and this would result in a closely woven linen. The pressure used in forcing the shot of weft home would tend to squeeze out the oil. With primitive hand-methods of beating-up, probably more oil would be used to soften the yarn.

H. MICHELL.

McMaster University.

¹ The passages are discussed by Studniczka in 'Beiträge zur Geschichte der altgriechischen Tracht' in *Abhandlungen des archäologisch-epigraphischen Seminars der Universität Wien*, VI. 1, p. 47.

REVIEWS

THE HOMERIC HYMNS IN THE BUDÉ SERIES.

Homère: *Hymnes*. Texte établi et traduit par Jean HUMBERT. (Collection des Universités de France.) Pp. 255. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1936. Paper, 30 fr.

THIS work will rank with the best of its series. Humbert in his helpful introduction makes particular acknowledgements to Allen and Sikes. (Allen-Sikes-Halliday is warmly recommended but appeared too late for use.) But he has himself examined all the '26' mss (? 25; see pp. 15, 17, 24 *bis*) save two.

His account of them differs but slightly from A.-S.-H. But he rejects S (cf. A.-S.-H. p. xlii), and hence ignores Agar's *λήσει* at *Apoll.* 55 (supported by S and 'undoubtedly right') and reads *Πιερίης* at *Apoll.* 216. His text is rightly conservative; but sometimes excessively so, as in keeping *ὕλην* at *Apoll.* 228. Hence it is rather surprising to see Wackernagel's *ἀέπτοις* at *Apoll.* 91, and Radermacher's proposals at *Herm.* 109, 280 (an 'odd conjecture', A.-S.-H. p. 320). Of the editor's own

few conjectures I give three samples: *Dem.* 13 *καδείας δ' ὀδμῇ πᾶς τ'* (after Mitscherlich); *Herm.* 346 *ἄθικτος* (but one wants the sense given by Edmonds, *C.Q.* XXXI p. 50); *Herm.* 383 *ἐπιθήσομαι*.

Humbert groups together the hymns devoted to the same deity. The arrangement is logical; it is right, e.g., that XXXIII should immediately precede XVII. Nor would it add seriously to difficulties of reference, were it not that there are series of consecutive unnumbered pages (the maximum is 12), and the page-numbers in the 'table des matières' do not appear on any page save (apparently by mistake) one.

A 'notice' prefixed to each group discusses chronology, and gives readable and up-to-date information on the divine names, cults and myths. Here the reader is often more generously treated than by A.-S.-H.'s slightly arid lists of references. Humbert believes that *Apoll.* falls into two parts; the first consists of 1-182, with 179-182 transposed to follow 142. (But '179-206 hold together,' say A.-S.-H., who vigorously defend the unity of the hymn.) One argument for the date of *Apoll.* (common to Humbert and A.-S.-H.), that 264-271 prove its priority to the Pythian Games, seems doubtful; what Telphusa 'said' before Apollo ever went to Delphi is scarcely evidence, or, at least, scarcely evidence of this. It is an interesting suggestion of Humbert's that *Dem.* 23 is inspired by *Aphr.* 259.

The brief notes give the help so desirable (but frequently missing) in editions of this kind; e.g. on *Herm.* 36 ('citation plaisante' etc.) and 378 ('Hermès retourne effrontément la vieille formule épique'—a little point

which might well have been mentioned in A.-S.-H.).

The translation is very exact. And Humbert has not forgotten that he is translating poetry, though he has successfully avoided a 'uniform air of conventional nobility.' He is ingenious with compound adjectives (to which French is not by nature kind), save perhaps where he himself lacks conviction ('qui ont un langage' is a trifle prosy for *μερόπων*). His aim has been to do justice to the ancient glosses without doing too much injustice to modern etymologies. On the hard words he is in general more informative than A.-S.-H.'s blunt confessions of ignorance. Lions receive a tawny hide in exchange for grim eyes; Lemnos is 'luxuriante' and smoulders no more; 'honte, confusion' is the suggested meaning of *ἐντροπήσει* (*Herm.* 245; A.-S.-H. give 'precautions'); and Dionysos becomes 'Chevreau' instead of 'insewn.' One may doubt 'Qu'on me donne *ma lyre*' at *Apoll.* 131 (*φίλη* is surely predicative as A.-S.-H. say). 'Un vieillard à face de brute' seems strange for *γέροντα κνώδαλον* (*Herm.* 187-188; here too A.-S.-H. are more convincing). Humbert has an ingenious interpretation of *Herm.* 409-410; but it is upset by A.-S.-H.'s view (no doubt correct) that Apollo is not trying to bind Hermes at this stage. On XXIX 5-6 he at least brings out the difficulty of *ἀρχόμενος*, with which A.-S.-H. do not help.

Misprints are few and trivial (save perhaps the omission of *p* from the stemma, p. 15). Humbert has placated Nemesis by omitting to translate seven words at *Herm.* 310-311.

J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

A NEW TEXT OF THE AGAMEMNON.

The Agamemnon of Aeschylus. A revised text with brief critical notes by A. Y. CAMPBELL, Professor of Greek in the University of Liverpool. Pp. xxiii + 126. London: Hodder and Stoughton (University Press of Liverpool), 1936. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

ACCORDING to the preface 'this should be the precursor of two other books. . .

The second will be a translation into English verse of the Greek text as here presented. . . . The third will be a full commentary, amply documented and furnished with an account and appreciation of the poem'. This makes it awkward to speak of the present edition without the support of the translation and the commentary. On

the other hand, the author expressly states that this 'is not the first of a set of three volumes' and wishes it to be regarded as a self-contained book. As for the text of the play, he claims that it is 'now finally in stable equilibrium'.¹ A review of the separate volume is therefore justified.

Following the line of his former articles on the subject, Mr. Campbell has to a great extent rewritten the text of the play. If you think you know the *Agamemnon* by heart, you may put your memory to the test by trying to recite the lines with your eyes fixed on the new edition. To an unparalleled degree we now see confirmed the sad statement made by G. Hermann (*Opusc.* V, p. 341) more than a hundred years ago: 'Aeschylum quam magis editur, tam magis sui dissimilem fieri video'. Mr. Campbell denotes as his main object the task of providing a 'readable' text, and repeatedly says that his book is to serve 'in usum lectorum'. Whether it is really fit for that purpose seems very doubtful, although it may have a stimulating effect on trained and very critical Aeschylean scholars.

Lehrs' famous commandment 'thou shalt not fall on thy knees before manuscripts' deserves peculiar obedience in the case of the *Agamemnon*. Our sources are, for the greater part of the play, appallingly poor, the only extant MSS being two 14th-century books, F and Tr. Had we to rely upon them for the beginning of the play as well, we should have nothing but e.g. 5 βροτοῖς θέρος, 23 νῦν φῶς πιφαύσκων, 48 κλάξαντες, 80 τρίποδος, 98 εἰπεῖν, 101 φαίνουσ', 119 φέρβοντο. Of course M is by no means faultless, but where it is preserved (and quite often supported by V) we are on much safer ground. Had Mr. Campbell been self-denying enough to be satisfied with a comparatively small number of conjectures where M still exists, and to reserve the bulk of

his suggestions for the more than 1200 lines where M is lost, he could have made his case very strong indeed. As it is he indiscriminately pours out his innovations over the whole play. 7-12 now appear as follows: τηρῶ δ' ὅταν φθίνωσιν ἀντολὰς τ' ἐγὼ καινὸν φυλάσσω λαμπάδος τι σύμβολον, αὐγὴν πυρὸς φέρουσαν ἐκ Τροίας φάσιν ἀλώσιμόν τε βάζειν· ὧδε γὰρ κρανεῖν γυναικὸς ἀνδρόβουλον ἐλπίζει κέαρ. ἔτ' αὖ δὲ κτλ.: 128-30 πάντα δὲ Τευκρῶν κτήνη σφακτὰ πρόπυργα τὰ δάμια Μοῖρα λαφύζει: 179 ff. πλάζει δ' ἀντίπνους πρὸ καρδίας μνασιπήμεν πνύος· καὶ παρ' ἀκοντας ἦλθε σωφρόνα: 186 μῆτιν οὐκ ἔτλα ψέγειν (μάντιν οὐτίνα ψέγων Aesch.): 197 πρισμοῖς (this sort of Ἑσυχασμός is a catching disease in the textual criticism of Aeschylus) κατέξαινον ἀρειον ἄνθος (τρίβῳ κατέξαινον ἄνθος Ἀργείων Aesch.): 250 τοῖς τοι παθοῦσιν (Hesychius again) θανεῖν (τοῖς μὲν παθοῦσιν μαθεῖν Aesch.): 1124 τραχεία δ' ἀχᾶ πονεῖ (ταχεία δ' ἅτα πέλει Aesch.).

The editor quite often endeavours to emend questionable passages, but at least as often he regards the mere fact that a possible interchange of letters appeals to his susceptible mind as sufficient reason to alter a faultless text. Some characteristic specimens can be found in the previous section. Here I select a few more. L. 331 πρὸς ἀρίστοισιν ὃν ἔχει πόλις: Mr. Campbell prints κόνις with the note: 'κόνις Karsten: πόλις codd. correctio non propterea minus pulchra quod est necessaria'. When the bewildered reader turns to Karsten's commentary for some enlightenment, he is given this piece of information: 'victores vescuntur prandio eorum quos pulvis s. humus habet'. Why not explain 'vescuntur prandio eorum quae pulvis habet' and quote in support Mephistopheles: 'Staub soll er fressen und mit Lust'? 419 ἔρρει πᾶσ' Ἀφροδίτα: Mr. Campbell prefers στερρὰ π. 'A. and adds 'ἔρρει recipiunt omnes, et ego opicus vocabor. at si periit omnis venus, unde fit ut odiosa sit venustas?' Everyone knows that in many Byzantine MSS κ is distinguished from β only by the length of the first stroke. Shall we therefore follow Mr. Campbell and allow the Aeschylean κάσις πηλοῦ . . .

¹ In the abstract of a paper on the *Agamemnon* read before the Cambridge Philological Society on 26 November 1936 (published in *Cambr. Univ. Reporter*, 9 December 1936), Mr. Campbell says: 'Despite the multiplicity of changes incorporated in the text of my edition, some of the reconstructive syntheses as there given are still in various degrees incomplete', and adds a number of further alterations.

κόνις of 494 to be debased to βάσις, despite Sept. 494? In 978 (μαντιπολεῖ δ' ἀκέλευστος ἄμσθος αἰοιδά) αἰοιδά has been replaced by ἀορτά, of which I need say nothing.

Mr. Campbell has a dictatorial way (*sit pro ratione voluntas*) of decreeing that things cannot have been written by Aeschylus or cannot be Greek at all. On 439: 'non graecum sapit μάχη δορός'. Had he troubled to look up Nauck's *Tragicæ dictionis index*, p. 156, he would have found three instances from Euripides. On 502 (where he changes ἀμαρτίαν into ἀμεξίαν): 'nusquam alibi reperio ἄμ. φρενῶν'. This may be, but I should be satisfied with Soph. *Ant.* 1262 φρενῶν δυσφρόνων ἀμαρτηματα or Pindar *P.* III. 13 ἀμπλακίαισι φρενῶν (ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ταῖς τῶν φρενῶν schol.). 513 'ἄπαξ Ἀπόλλων Campb.: ἀναξ Ἀπολλων edd., sed nusquam ita languet noster'. 537 'θῆμαρτια codd., sed haec est vox nihili'. It is in fact one of the many fresh coinages of Aeschylus, fully explained by Wilamowitz, *Glaube der Hellenen*, II, p. 120, n.1. It seems as if to Mr. Campbell 'vox nihili' sometimes became synonymous with ἄπαξ λεγόμενον. Accordingly he remarks again on 356 κτεάτειρα: 'est vox nihili'. The formation of that word is indeed worth noting, but by no means objectionable; see the thorough discussion by Ernst Fraenkel, *Geschichte der griechischen Nomina agentis* (Strassburg, 1912) II, p. 29 f. On 620 ff.: 'isto modo loquuntur neque Graeci neque homines'. 962: 'δόμος οὐκ ἐπίσταται πένεσθαι est locutio putidissima, qualem neque in lingua graeca invenies et nervosus ille stilus nostri ante omnes aversatur'; therefore he writes πένησι δ' οὐκ ἐπίσταται δόμοις. On 1082: 'ignoro equidem istud οὐ μόλις', disregarding, of course, Wilamowitz's note on *Eum.* 864 and altering the text there as well as in Eur. *Hel.* 334. On 1398: 'quis umquam scripsit ἀραία κακά?' To ask such a question is certainly not enough to discredit an intensely tragic phrase which here makes excellent sense.

Sometimes the editor's criticism seems to have arisen from misunderstanding. 474: 'ὑπακτῶν Campb.: ὑπ' ἄλλων codd. Nec poterat mentiri

Washington, neque ego construere ὑπ' ἄλλων (vel ἄλλω Karsten) βίον κατίδοιμ'. There is no need to construe like that. The obvious thing is to connect ὑπ' ἄλλων with ἀλούς; then βίον, though not expressly qualified, receives a special meaning from the preceding words (I agree with Abresch, Sidgwick, Wecklein against Schütz, Headlam and others). 578: 'νεῶς Campb.: θεοῖς codd. quis umquam aut spolia adfixit deis (non delubris ut Hor. *carm.* III 5. 19) aut θεοὶ οἱ καθ' Ἑλλάδα dixit cum vellet θεοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων?' As to the latter objection, Aeschylus has chosen to stress the local view ('the Gods throughout all Hellas' Headlam) and thus to obtain the antithesis Τροίαν . . . Ἑλλάδα; it is not our business to correct him. As to the former, there is in the MS text no such nonsense as 'spolia adfixit deis'; what Aeschylus actually says is 'unto the Gods . . . were pinned up these trophies, to be a monumental glory for their shrines' (Headlam). Why does Mr. Campbell, who has worked through all the editions, not tell us that since Stanley (1663) the striking parallel [Eur.] *Rhes.* 180 θεοῖσιν αὐτὰ (scil. τὰ λάφυρα) πασσάλευε πρὸς δόμοις belongs to the stock-in-trade of the commentators? 919 θωπὸς Campb.: φωτὸς codd. 'de femina sola nusquam alibi φῶς'. There are, of course, several commentators who refer βαρβάρου φωτὸς δίκην to the subject of the sentence, but the majority, from Schütz to Wilamowitz (translation), Verrall, Headlam, Murray (transl.), accept the interpretation of the scholiast μὴ ὡς βαρβάρῳ μοι κέλενε θρύπτεσθαι. That this is what Aeschylus meant is evident from the parallelism of γυναικὸς ἐν τρόποις and βαρβάρου φωτὸς δίκην.

While banishing a considerable number of old-established tragic words and phrases, the new edition betrays a strange fancy for some latecomers in the history of Greek. 323 'οὐκ ἴδοις ἡνωμένῳ Campb.: οὐ φίλως προσενέποις codd.' As far as I can see, ἐνοῦν does not occur before Aristotle and even the pre-Aristotelean existence of ἔνωσις is extremely doubtful; see Kranz on Philolaos B 10 (*Vorsokr.* I⁶, p. 410). To say nothing of the meaning of

πρόκοιτοι, which has usurped the place of προφήται in 409, it is definitely a Hellenistic word, and so is προθύρωμα (πρόρθμευμα Aesch.) 1558; as to 'ἀφελῶς sincere, quippe quae non esset cantatrix ad hoc conducta' (note on 247, see also 805), Pearson's note on Soph. fr. 723 might have warned the editor.

If neither the language of tragedy nor later Greek supplies sufficient material for conjectures, the editor will resort to new words. They are partly inventions of earlier scholars, e.g. Verrall's τοπά 175 (Headlam knew better) and 682, Keck's πεπλώδης 1126 (after the model of that luckless scholar the whole passage is now corrupted once again), Meineke's τάγαρχος 1227, Bothe's φόνευσις 1325, partly coinages of Mr. Campbell such as 1263 ἀντιπίσασθαι, 1550 ἀγαθεία.

If it were not for the sake of the future commentary I should not mention two small points of grammar, both concerning the dual. It is not justifiable to change 44 Ἀτρεΐδαν to Ἀτρεΐδαν (see H. L. Ahrens, *Philol. Suppl.* I, p. 234; A. Cuny, *Le nombre duel en grec*, Paris, 1906, p. 134, n. 2; J. Wackernagel, *Sprachl. Unters. z. Homer*, p. 57), nor is there any evidence for forms such as 1384 οἰωγμάτων (Elmsley, οἰωγμάσιν codd.) being ever used in tragedy (see Wecklein, *Curae Epigraphicae*, p. 16 f.; E. Hasse, *Über den Dual bei den griech. Dramatikern* [1891], p. 11 ff.; Cuny, *op. cit.*, p. 96).

In dealing with metre Mr. Campbell is sometimes arbitrary. Of 122 κεδνός δὲ he says 'contra metrum est'. κεδνός (--) at the beginning of the verse corresponds with κύριος (- ο ο). Exactly the same responson is to be found *Pers.* 882 οἶα=891 καὶ Ῥόδον, *Eum.* 1042 λαμπάδι=1046 οὐτω. On 466 he writes κτίζουσ' with Kennedy, 'τιθεῖσ' codd., sed cf. stropham'. The same responson occurs in 197 τρίβω=210 ρείθροις, but there Mr. Campbell has altered the text of the strophe; he is probably prepared to do the same with *Suppl.* 793 πρὸς δν=801 ὄρνι(σι), 794 ἢ λισ(σάς)=802 τὸ γάρ and so forth. On the other hand, he introduces into the dochmiac 1147 (where he follows Enger in writing περέβαλόν γε οἱ) a hiatus which I cannot swallow. Are

we perhaps to conjure up the ghost of a digamma from the dead?

The editor likes using one conjecture as evidence for another; see his notes on 395, 422, 520 f., 796, and several other passages.

There are doubtless lacunae in our MSS of the play. But Mr. Campbell is much too lavish in adding lines of his own. I cannot see any need for his supplements 301^a, 323^a, 1276^a, 1554^{a, b} (that these anapaests are not strophic has been briefly stated by Wilamowitz, *Interpr.*, p. 198, and fully proved by Kranz, *Hermes* LIV (1919), p. 319). After 39 the queen shouts from inside the palace ἐλελεῦ ἐλελεῦ, and after 957 she repeats the same performance on the stage. Here we find a stage-direction 'stupent omnes', and well they might, but the critical note assures us 'nihil certius'. In close connection with that restitution Clytemnestra's speech 958 ff. ἔστιν θάλασσα has been transferred to after 929 and enlarged by a new line at its end.

A discussion of Mr. Campbell's views on the dramatic action may better be postponed until his commentary is published. Meanwhile I would ask him to reconsider a few points. Like Hermann and many others he believes that Clytemnestra enters the stage during the anapaests 39 ff.; his note, however, on 39^a shows that he is aware of the difficulty. In my view Enger, Wecklein, and Kranz have definitely proved (mainly from the analogy of the *Ajax* and the *Hippolytus*) that the words 83 ff. σὺ δὲ . . . βασιλεία Κλυταιμῆστρα κτλ. are addressed to the absent queen and that she does not appear before 254 (see also Headlam). After 488 there can be no 'intervallum aliquot dierum' as Blomfield thought and Mr. Campbell thinks with him; apart from other reasons, 489 ff. unmistakably refer to 475 ff. In 1061 the editor takes καρβάνω χερί as said of the arm of a 'pedisequus', yet the trend of the whole scene and also the use of κάρβανος in the *Supplices* shows that the phrase goes together with 1051 φωνὴ βάρβαρος and refers to Cassandra. The lack of what modern people call logic in 1060 f. inevitably arises out of the contingency that a person who is supposed to under-

stand no Greek is a character in a Greek play.

Unconscious allegiance to the manner of Housman is noticeable throughout the book. Incidentally, Mr. Campbell puts nine of Housman's conjectures (I am including l. 1206, where Housman's *πελαστής* has been modified into *πελάτης*) in the text, although all of them belong to the *opus iuvenile* of that great scholar.

ἄλλος γε τούτων. There are, fortunately, statements in the book which will meet with the agreement of any reasonable scholar. So, for instance, people who have recently been considering the plan of writing a commentary on the *Agamemnon* have arrived at the same conclusion as Mr. Campbell, viz. that what we really want is a book which 'in part should almost resemble a variorum edition, for many good things have been said about details of the play by many different critics' (p. vii). Besides, it is useful to warn the ordinary reader that nowadays the value of Schütz's work is often not sufficiently recognized, although Mr. Campbell exaggerates when he says (p. xvii f.) 'nobody now ever speaks of Schütz'; see, e.g., Wilamowitz, *praef.*, p. vii. With regard to Wilamowitz himself, I like the candour of the following confessions (p. xix): 'every time I have blessed Wecklein I have grumbled at Wilamowitz', and after a few sentences: 'there is after all no getting away from Wilamowitz'. The editor's general verdict (p. xx f.) on Wilamowitz's edition is, on the whole, justified; that he could have learnt much more from its notes is another story.

Many of Mr. Campbell's doubts and queries would be far more helpful if he did not spoil the effect by rash solutions. Yet even so a future editor of the play will have to take his scruples into account. Here again I cannot give a full list but only point to a few passages at random. 78 Ἀρης δ' οὐκ ἐνι is rightly kept, though Weil's *χλωρῶ* at the end will not do. That 501 f. should be given to the same speaker as the preceding speech is at least worth considering (see also Kranz's argument, *Stasimon*, p. 276); it does not matter

that Mr. Campbell says 'continuavi' instead of 'continuavit Scaliger'. As to whether 1094 ἐνθ' (ὄν codd.), which the editor takes from Platt, is right, I have not yet made up my mind; it is, at any rate, tempting (for the 'absolute' usage of *ματεύειν* without an object see *Choeph.* 331 with Schadewaldt's note, *Hermes* LVII, 1932, p. 320, n. 3). The deletion of 1226, where Mr. Campbell has unearthed A. Ludwig's athetesis, convinced me at once when he put it forward in an article in 1935. Only so does τῷ μολόντι δεσπότῃ obtain its proper relation and its strong emphasis.

From the perplexity of details let us at last turn to a question of principle. It is almost certain that the text of the *Agamemnon*, or at any rate the greater part of it, must once have been very different from what is now preserved in one or two late Byzantine MSS. It is, moreover, extremely likely that the language of Aeschylus contained many elements which we are unable to trace from our scanty materials. The editor, therefore, has always to bear in mind the precariousness of his text. But he must not 'forget the nature of his business and turn from work to play'. Rather should he from time to time remember the maxim *quod vides perisse perditum ducas*. In Mr. Campbell's edition there is not a single dagger left, nor is any of the numerous supplements and additions accompanied by a note such as 'exempli gratia' or the like. It is the product of an amazing optimism. 'aut haec emendatio vera est, aut ego sum magnus poeta' (note on 568).

This book is the work of a gifted and industrious scholar and, moreover, one who is actuated by a true, though often distorted, enthusiasm for Aeschylus. He has taken laborious pains in examining the former editions and a considerable number of articles. For many years past he has not ceased pondering over the numerous riddles of the text. Unfortunately his alert imagination, unchecked by an accurate scrutiny of all available evidence, runs away with him, and so the *pruritus coniciendi* again and again gets the better of his more scholarly qualities. His devotion to the poet together with

his knowledge and acuteness could help a great deal to elucidate some dark passages of the difficult text. As it is, his endeavours, even if they deal with a real and not merely with an imaginary crux, may possibly have the effect of sending us back to loose thinking and sham conservatism. Could Mr. Campbell only determine to form a clear idea of the limits set to any, even the most powerful, textual criticism! Unless he

does so, all his labours will be lost. We believe him when he confesses (note on 714) 'in hoc loco multum sudavi' or (on 788) 'vix usquam plus sudavi aut ingemui', yet we should like to see him spared the fate of the wretched hero who *versat saxum sudans nitendo neque proficit hilum*.

EDUARD FRAENKEL.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

AESCHYLUS AND THE TRILOGY.

Georges MÉAUTIS : *Eschyle et la Trilogie*. Pp. 284. Paris: Grasset, 1936. Paper, 25 fr.

THE title of this book, and the preface, raise expectations which are hardly fulfilled. The author explains that it was written in the belief that a study of the work of Aeschylus not only in itself but 'en fonction de ce qu'on appelle la trilogie' would contribute to a clearer impression of the man and his thought. A reasonable hope; but in the book which follows there is little to be discerned of the 'special angle of approach' here promised. It is an analysis of the extant plays, full and interesting, elegantly written and with some just observation, but not obviously dominated by the notion of the trilogy. Since six of the plays were composed as parts of trilogies, naturally any analysis worth the name must expound them as such; but, except that he omits the *Persae*, it is difficult to see that Professor Méautis's interpretation is written in any more special sense from this angle. There is no attempt to examine the evidence for the reconstruction of the missing parts of the Danaid, Theban and Promethean trilogies, no mention even of the lost plays or indication of how often Aeschylus appears to have used this form of composition or what kind of material he chose for it. The trilogy is not considered in itself as a problem in dramatic construction, yet without such technical study it is impossible to do justice either to Aeschylus's manner of developing a theme or to the variety of his artistic invention. To take an obvious example, the content of the Achilleid groups can be reconstructed with sufficient certainty

to suggest a quite different kind of dramatic unity in the trilogy sequence. Even in his analysis of the extant plays Professor Méautis, like so many other interpreters of Aeschylus, hardly stresses sufficiently the difference between the *Septem* and the *Eumenides* as the closing act of a tragic theme.

For the rest, the book is written more for the general reader with a knowledge of Greek than for the scholar or specialist, and from this point of view is much to be recommended as a help to the understanding and appreciation of Aeschylus's thought. Occasionally, perhaps, the author's lovingly minute study of his subject tempts him to discover refinements of excellence invisible to the more critical gaze; is it not rather fanciful, for instance, to detect 'une ambiance marine,' 'l'odeur de la mer toute proche,' as the prevailing atmosphere of the *Supplices*? And in his desire to do justice to the archaic beauties of the earlier plays he sometimes appears to suggest that action is a superfluous element in drama, almost a defect; Aristotle's pronouncements on this subject are dismissed as puerile, and the Athenian judges who awarded the *O.T.* no more than second prize are praised for recognizing the limitations of a play 'où l'action est tout et les caractères peu de chose.' But such a view has little regard for the prodigious development in Aeschylus's art itself. The *Agamemnon* soars above the *Supplices* or the *Septem* just because it is not merely great poetry but great drama. And it is possible to recognize the majesty of the Aeschylean trilogy without decrying the artistic merit of the

self-c
more
focus
speak
'mai

Albre
kle
den
Str
lan
12

THE
know
articl
Now
book
many
popu
with
book
physi
book
Wein
saying
der N
Prom
er ein
ideas
histor
occup
are th
gories
absen
the en
know
told t
Schm
ation
mon i

The
with t
thoug
much
writte
shado
Pratin
tender
to me
the pe
tion, a
until
his frie

The
NO. O

self-contained single drama with its more concentrated action and sharply focussed individual characters. To speak of Sophocles and Euripides as 'mains débiles'—too feeble to bend the

bow of the elder Odysseus—is an irrelevant and valueless judgment.

A. M. DALE.

Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.

A NEW STUDY OF SOPHOCLES.

Albrecht VON BLUMENTHAL: *Sophokles. Entstehung und Vollendung der griechischen Tragödie*. Pp. 284. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1936. Inland prices: paper, RM. 10; bound, 12.

THE author of this book is already known to scholars by his excellent article on Sophocles in Pauly-Wissowa. Now he has written the third popular book on Sophocles to appear in Germany in the last five years. In Germany popularity is apparently synonymous with difficulty, and the more popular a book is the more abstract and metaphysical terms it contains. The new book is not so difficult as Reinhardt or Weinstock but has its quota of dark sayings, such as 'Philoktetes leidet an der Natur, die für ihn ein Schicksal ist, Prometheus leidet in der Natur, für die er ein Schicksal ist'. But the general ideas, the categories which direct the history of earlier Greek literature which occupies nearly two-fifths of the book, are the Dionysiac and Apollinian categories of Nietzsche. Footnotes are absent: a few references are given at the end, but the scholar is expected to know his literature and the amateur is told that he can find all he wants in Schmid-Stählin: this lack of documentation also is a retrograde step, too common in modern German scholarship.

The two-fifths of the book which deal with the history of Greek literature and thought before Sophocles do not need much commentary. They are sensibly written and find space even for such shadowy figures as Phrynichus and Pratinas. The account of the Ionian tendencies in Pisistratid Athens seems to me particularly good. Aeschylus is the poet of the new Marathon generation, and does not get his recognition until the generation of Miltiades and his friends have ceased to hold office.

The three-fifths of the work which

are devoted to Sophocles consist of short sections on life, gods, heroes and heroines, and speech, and then brief running commentaries on each of the seven plays. In the section on the gods the author takes the same line as E. Turolla in the book reviewed in these columns in 1934, that Oedipus, Deianira etc. are not responsible for their sufferings. 'Göttlicher Ratschluss dem Menschen als Willkür erscheinend—das ist der Inbegriff sophokleischer Tragik'. This view I believe to be erroneous, since it detracts from the greatness of Sophocles' characters by diminishing their responsibility.

The running commentaries on the plays are for the most part good and bring out the significant moments in the development of the plot; the general introduction to the later plays, in particular the *Philoktetes* (e.g. on rhetoric, p. 221), is also good. Technique, whether of plot-construction, character-drawing or scenic production, is left entirely on one side, and the reader is not told that such speeches as the *enthymeme* in the *Antigone*, the first monologue in the *Ajax*, and the chariot-race in the *Electra* admit of widely differing interpretations. And the author states without equivocation that the *Trachiniae* is a late play. There are occasional inaccuracies, as when *Antigone* is said to be present during the discussion between Haemon and Creon.

The author is also too eager to find an occasion for each play. The most startling instance is his suggestion that the *Ajax* is in some sense a representation of the first contest between Aeschylus and Sophocles, which is reported in Plutarch; this produces the following equations: Ajax = Aeschylus, Odysseus = Sophocles, and the Atreidae = the Athenian *strategi*. That the *Tyrannus* has some connection with the plague

and the curse on Pericles would probably be generally admitted; it is probably safe to see in Oedipus a good deal of the ideal Athenian as reflected in the Funeral Speech. But the author does not apparently draw the further consequence that Sophocles at the mildest looked on this ideal with suspicion, and therefore he finds in the *hybris* anti-strophe of the second stasimon (873) a possible allusion to Cleon. 'Die Gegenstrophe führt noch weiter aus dem my-

thischen Geschehen heraus: erinnerte sie den attischen Hörer an die Ehrsuchtigen, zumal an Kleon, die nach dem Tode des Perikles sich um die Leitung des Staates drängten?' But is it so unlikely that the chorus, after what they have seen and heard in the preceding act, should reflect that *hybris* is part of a king's make-up?

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University of Manchester.

THE PRESOCRATICS.

DIELS: *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*.

Griechisch und deutsch von Hermann

DIELS. Fünfte Auflage herausgegeben von Walther KRANZ. Band II.

Pp. 427. Berlin: Weidmann, 1935.

Cloth, RM. 32 (unbound, 27).

THE second volume of Kranz's edition of *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* follows the same lines as the first, which I reviewed in C.R. L 19. It is for the most part a reproduction of Diels' 1922 reprint, embodying the 'Nachträge' with the rest, but making very few further additions or alterations. In his handling of the text Kranz has continued his conservative policy, often returning to the manuscript reading in place of Diels' conjectures. In the notes he has added a number of bibliographical references which should prove useful, although limited almost entirely to German scholarship. But the greatest improvement is once again in his translation of the fragments.

In his Foreword to the Fourth Edition, Diels expressed an intention to give the Democritus chapter 'eine übersichtlichere Form', and to complete the section on the Sophists. Unfortunately, however, he left no instructions as to how these tasks were to be carried out, and therefore Kranz has not attempted them. Democritus remains practically unaltered. The Sophists now include Lycophron among their number, although some will be inclined to dispute his right to a place among the Pre-Socratics; and they possess some three or four new fragments. (One of these—Thrasymachus B6a—seems entirely unjustified. Why should the remark *εἶναι τὸ δίκαιον*

οὐκ ἄλλο τι ἢ τὸ τοῦ κρείττονος ξυμφέρων be selected out of all that Thrasymachus says in the *Republic* as a quotation from the historical Thrasymachus?) What is more important, Kranz has added a translation of the fragments in this section, which was entirely lacking before. But those who use the *Vorsokratiker* will regret that he has not found it possible to effect the new treatment of the Sophists which Diels had in mind and which students of ancient philosophy so badly need.

The second volume closes with eight pages of corrections and additions—a surprising number, considering the slightness of the changes in the work as a whole. The Index volume is promised for Easter 1937.

All scholars interested in Greek thought will be grateful to Kranz—and to the printers—for this reproduction of the *Vorsokratiker* in a more up-to-date and attractive form. But the serious limitations of this new edition raise a question which affects every such collection of material: whether it is possible for a work of this type, which should draw on the scholarship of every country in which classical books or periodicals are published, to be satisfactorily handled by a single individual. Diels accomplished the feat, but a scholar with his range of knowledge is a rare phenomenon in any generation. In most cases might not the task be more easily and thoroughly carried out by a group—preferably an international group—of experts working in co-operation?

H. C. BALDRY.

University of Cape Town.

A STUDY IN PLATO.

W. F. R. HARDIE: *A Study in Plato*. Pp. xiii + 172. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

THIS is a book of very great interest, and I hope that it will stimulate other students of Plato's thought to further work on the same lines. It treats Plato not merely as a subject for exposition and commentary, but as a philosopher whose work calls for discussion as a positive contribution to philosophic theory. From this point of view the author asks, not merely what Plato said or meant, but whether his views are 'true or at least plausible'. And he proceeds on the entirely sound assumption that his 'doctrine represents thought about real questions and not poetic imagination', or a 'mere arbitrary fancy'. The chief subjects that are discussed from this point of view are the Theory of Forms and the theory of knowledge implied by it, and the nature of the soul and the Platonic view of God. There is very little said, except incidentally, about ethical questions, and nothing about Plato's contribution to political thought.

The book, as a whole, shows many of the qualities most needed in a philosopher. Mr Hardie is always fair-minded, careful and thorough, and he has a high standard of precision and exactness in the use of language. But it is only natural that the conclusions of a discussion such as this will be far more open to differences of opinion than the work of a mere commentator. Even some of those who do not accept the Platonic theories as absolutely true may feel that they have a good deal more plausibility than Mr Hardie allows. On matters of interpretation, too, as well as of evaluation, there is plenty of room for difference of opinion. Mr Hardie deals with many of the most disputed questions, and on them all he takes a definite line, which is always supported

by careful and well-thought-out arguments. As it happens, in almost every case the view he adopts is the exact opposite of that which I should be inclined to adopt myself. But I can recognize that there are always serious arguments for the view he adopts, and it is a real service to have them set out so clearly.

I would venture, however, one general criticism. Mr Hardie seems to me to be inclined to lay a good deal too much emphasis on the detailed dissection of phrases and the minute detection of apparent inconsistencies in the use of words. No doubt, verbal precision is a valuable quality. But it is important to realize that, particularly in the early stages of the development of a novel view, people have to be brought to see what is meant by the use of language with which they are already familiar, and that, just in so far as the view is novel, such language cannot be exact. There must be a good deal of metaphor about it, and a variety of alternative modes of expression will have to be tried. I feel that it is a failure to see that which makes Mr Hardie take the Megarian criticisms of the Theory of Forms in the first half of the *Parmenides* more seriously than they deserve, and more seriously than I believe Plato took them. There is, indeed, something of the Megarian 'eristic dialectic' about Mr Hardie. Some of his criticisms of Burnet and Taylor, on the interpretation of the *Parmenides*, seem to me to apply more to particular phrases they used than to the substance of their contentions.

This is, however, a fault on the right side. And I should not like to leave the subject without expressing my great appreciation of the stimulating and suggestive line of approach which Mr Hardie has opened up.

G. C. FIELD.

University of Bristol.

EPICURUS ON PLATO.

Wolfgang SCHMID: *Epikurs Kritik der platonischen Elementenlehre*. Pp. 64. Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1936. Paper, RM. 4.

EPICURUS as a critic of the physical theories of others is a comparatively little-known figure, though the fragments of *περὶ φύσεως* XIV which Mr.

Schmid edits and explains were published from papyri at Herculaneum by Gomperz as long ago as 1867, collated later by Sudhaus for the Berlin Academy, and re-edited by Vogliano in 1932. They were recognised by Gomperz as containing arguments against the Platonic identification of the popular elements with the regular solids in *Timaues* 53 ff., and this account of them has never been seriously questioned, though to those who adopt Taylor's view of the *Timaues* they will seem to be directed more against fifth-century Pythagoreanism than against Plato.

The most interesting point which emerges from a study of these arguments is that they have much in common with those aimed at the same theory by Aristotle in *de caelo* 305b28-307b24, with which Epicurus seems to have been acquainted. He follows Aristotle in the criticism that Plato's theory implies the existence of atoms, since division of a pyramid, for example, does not yield pyramids, and ignores, like Aristotle, the fact that the Platonic theory resolves its corpuscles into triangular surfaces,

not into similar corpuscles; as far as we know, he did not make the valid criticism that it is impossible for a solid body to be constructed out of plane surfaces (for this see *de caelo* 306a23); indeed in Fr. K. col. 1 he appears to speak of the triangles as σώματα.

In his reconstruction of the fragments Mr. Schmid in the main follows Vogliano. Where he differs from him he differs with good reason, and his own suggestions are sensible and well supported by a knowledge of Epicurus' usage. The syntax of Fr. J. col. 1 still, however, seems unsatisfactory, though the sense is fairly clear. The commentary is economical and on the whole convincing, though it is perhaps rash to describe Heraclides Ponticus on p. 38 as one 'der die platonische Lehre für ein grösseres Publikum leichtfasslich dargestellt hat.' He seems rather to have had some affinity to atomism, and to be much farther from Plato than Speusippus and Xenocrates; Diogenes Laertius 5. 86 makes him latterly a pupil of Aristotle.

W. HAMILTON.

Eton College, Windsor.

LUCIAN TRANSLATED.

Lucian, with an English translation by A. M. HARMON. Vol. V. Pp. vii + 537. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1936. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

THE fifth volume of Mr. Harmon's translation of Lucian is a rather mixed bag. It contains such amusing works as *Peregrinus*, the *Fugitivi* and the *Concilium Deorum*, but it also contains the dull and overloaded diatribe of the *Pseudologista* and the laboured ingenuities of the *Tyrannicida* and *Abdicatus*. The translation has the same merits as were shown in the previous volume, vigour and variety, and usually conciseness; but it also still has the two shortcomings to which I called attention when I reviewed the fourth volume, for Mr. Harmon still fails to bring out the predicative force of adjectives: e.g. τὴν ἀλλήν δύναμιν ὡς πλείστην ('a very large force') and γυμνὸν τὸ ἔργον ('the naked facts'), and he still has unneces-

sarily elaborate renderings of rather ordinary modes of address, e.g. ὦ θαυμάσιε ('you amazing fellow') and ὦ γενναῖε ('my high-spirited friend'). He suits his English style to the varied styles of the original; thus in the *Lexiphanes* he would have made Osric himself jealous by his euphuism, and in the *Astrologia* he has a very successful imitation of the style of Sir Thomas Browne—but would Browne have said 'humans'? He has very felicitous renderings: I quote from many examples αἰδοῖ τοῦ σχήματος 'out of respect for their cloth', ἐδώδимуs 'good for a meal', ὑπερήμεροι τῆς ἐορτῆς 'too late for the fair', and ἀποπνίγει 'sticks in my gorge'.

The translation is generally accurate, but ἔσχε (p. 29) should be taken as ingressive, and on the same page there seems no reason to translate ἡ τραγωδία as 'the tragedies', when the allusion might be to one definite play like the

Trachiniae. On p. 351 γέτοσιν οὖσιν has been omitted in the translation. On pp. 395 and 405 περιβόητος has two different renderings: 'have made a great noise' and 'notorious'. The former of these can hardly stand for the slang 'to be a big noise'. On

p. 485 προδώσουσαν must agree with τὴν τέχνην and cannot mean 'betray the profession'. There is a misprint in the Greek text on p. 456, where ἀχάριστος is printed for ἀχάριστον.

A. S. OWEN.

Kemble College, Oxford.

A GERMAN VERSION OF THE *STROMATEIS*.

Titus Flavius Klemens von Alexandria: *Die Teppiche*. Deutscher Text nach der Uebersetzung von Franz OVERBECK. Pp. vii + 776. Basel: Benno Schwabe and Co., 1936. Paper, RM. 20 (bound, RM. 24).

As Professor of Church History in the University of Basle, Overbeck made a deep and protracted study of Clement, and this posthumous edition of the first German translation of the *Stromateis* is the fruits of it. The means were furnished by his widow, who left a sum of money to found the Franz Overbeck-Stiftung with the object of making his Nachlass available to scholars or preparing new editions, should the need arise, of his published works. His translation of the *Stromateis* was chosen as the first of what may be a longish series of publications.

Pp. 3-161 are occupied by introductory matter: O.'s Life and Work, incorporating highly interesting autobiographical material, a critical account of his analytical work on Clement, and a short essay on C.'s place in the history of the Church; for this part Dr. Carl Bernoulli is responsible, and it is followed by a succinct account of the editions and translations of the *Stromateis* and a very brief discussion of the plan of the work. The translation itself occupies pp. 165-643, and the indexes pp. 645 to the end. The book is very carefully printed and well arranged.

I cannot claim to have read the translation from end to end, but I have tested it closely in several places and

found it excellent. It is fluent and readable and at times highly eloquent, and if in the seventh book it hardly reaches the august simplicity of Hort and Mayor's, perhaps that was hardly to be expected. In the more difficult passages (and they are multitudinous) O. sometimes shirks the difficulty by making a somewhat more periphrastic rendering than usual; in others his version has a rotundity which is lacking in the Greek and a modicum of exegesis is introduced by way of clarification. Occasionally the translation bears little relation to the Greek, so that it is hard to detect what text lay before his eyes; and the editors speak of a certain French raciness in his prose, which may well be there, for he was educated in France up to the age of thirteen. But there is one great drawback: he had died before Otto Stählin's epoch-making three-volume edition of Clement appeared. The *Stromateis* exist in only one manuscript, the XIth-century Laurentianus, and O. used Dindorf's uncorrected publication of it: not until Stählin was the text scientifically edited and Dindorf's many inaccuracies in collation corrected. However, Mr. Bernoulli knows Stählin's work and has read it with a careful eye; and so far as was possible without radical alteration in the character of O.'s translation he and Mr. Ludwig Früchtel have removed the more obvious blemishes and supplemented their original where it was defective.

C. R. C. ALLBERRY.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

RENDEL HARRIS PAPYRI.

The Rendel Harris Papyri of Woodbrooke College, Birmingham. Edited with Translation and Notes by J. Enoch POWELL. Pp. xii+134; portrait and 5 plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1936. Cloth and boards, 15s.

EACH new collection of papyri has an interest and a value of its own: *papyrus papyrum docet*; and in the Rendel Harris Papyri Mr. Powell finds a solution for some problems hitherto unsolved. He is to be congratulated on his skill in dealing with documents of widely different types. The format and the whole method of publication of P. Harr. are uniform with the Oxyrhynchus Papyri; for frontispiece there is a fine portrait of Dr. Rendel Harris, who obtained the papyri in Egypt and inspired the editor; and on five plates thirty-seven papyri are reproduced 'in the confident hope that this will assist the identification of portions of the same papyri' in other collections.

The volume illustrates well the precarious nature of the papyrologist's work. In an appendix a last-minute identification of a scrap of Demosthenes *In Midiam* is printed—a triumph of detection. Since publication, too, Mr. Powell has informed the editors of *C.R.* that his largest 'new' fragment has been identified as Musonius Rufus XV A (apud Stobaeum), whereby more than a score of his numerous conjectural supplements are discovered to be wrong. Here is an object-lesson of the risk of even cautious restorations where sentences are incomplete; in the text also, some of the letters not marked as doubtful have been misread.¹ The last eighteen lines of the papyrus are new,

¹ A revised transcription and collation are to be published by Mr. Powell in *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*; also an identification of No. 12 as Plat. *Alc.* I. p. 107c ff.

extending the extract given by Stobaeus, and are fortunately well preserved. (At the end of line 47, to supply *εἴη* instead of *εἴπεις* would reduce the number of letters to the more probable 22; and the translation of line 37 omits three words in the text.)

Four fragments (No. 38) from a roll containing Euripides *Medea* show a text of good quality which confirms four conjectures and offers two new readings (1288 *ὑπερτείνουσα*, 1290 *οὐ* for *οὐν*). No. 61, a decree of Ptolemy Philometor, attests the existence of *εἰκονισμός* as early as 176-170 B.C.; while No. 64, a contract between officials, iii/iv A.D., sheds new light on the duties of the phylarch, and supplies a term *φυλακρισία*, 'perhaps meaning the registration of the members of the *phyle*.' Among other new words for the lexicographer is *ἀγλαόμολπος* in an epic fragment. In a magical papyrus of ii/A.D. (instructions for holding commerce with a spirit), a familiar Biblical phrase is expanded—'thou whose seat is heaven, the air thy revelling-place (*κωμαστήριον*), and the earth thy footstool': the formula is not to be recited aloud, but *θυμῶ*. The private letters, eleven in number, are of average interest.²

There remain for future publication miscellaneous non-literary fragments in Greek, and some Coptic papyri: of these the editor says without enthusiasm that they 'might moderately repay a further sifting'. W. G. WADDELL.

Cairo.

² In 80⁸³ read *ἀκριθον*; in 53⁸ accent *ταύρω* (also Index p. 133 *ταῦρος*); in 69⁸ the colloquial 'lumped' is not justified by *μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων* of the papyrus; p. 35, after 'connection and purpose', read 'are', while the printers' D 2 at the foot of the same page is awkwardly placed near the geometrical figure.

GREEK METAPHOR.

Greek Metaphor. Studies in Theory and Practice. By W. Bedell STANFORD. Pp. x+156. Oxford: Blackwell, 1936. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

THE author of this book justly observes that his subject has not received from English writers the attention it deserves.

To remedy this neglect he brings a vigorous and independent mind, and a measure of real imagination. It is with the greater regret that the reviewer feels bound to say that, in its present form, the book will scarcely do.

To begin with, Mr. Stanford puts him-

self in a disadvantageous position by his attitude towards his predecessors. To treat the views upon metaphor, I will not say of Max Müller or even Goldsmith, but of Plato and Aristotle, with a sort of genial intolerance is a line which none of us can afford to take. It is not a question of taste but of method. It could surprise no one if Aristotle, patiently studied and rightly understood, were nearer the essential truth about metaphor than Mr. Stanford, whose own definition, conveyed in an immoderately long and involved sentence, is at least a remarkable *tour de force*.

There are some errors in the book, some serious misprints, and a considerable number of highly disputable assertions. The limits of this review prevent the enumeration of these. Let me rather mention such passages as appear to make an original contribution to the subject. It is one of the author's convictions that grammarians and even scholars in general are apt to take too unimaginative a view of the language with which they are dealing, especially when it is the language of poetry. What he says on this point is excellent. But what of his examples? Two are from the *Agamemnon*. On 659 he deprecates the notion that Aeschylus meant to describe the sea as 'aflower' with corpses. But, unless the poet thought of the corpses as already bloated by drowning (which seems unlikely), he would not regard them as objects of abhorrence (cf. 461), still less as 'scum' or an eruption upon

the face of the waters. It would scarcely be kind to comment upon Mr. Stanford's alternative derivation of *ἄνθος* from *ἀνατίθημι* or *ἀνωθεῖν*; but one may say that he hardly appears to realize that most scholars do know that *ἄνθος* does not always mean a flower of the field. His other illustration is the phrase *χερῶν ἄκρους κτένας* (1594), upon which he remarks that *κτένας* is not a metaphor, since the fingers were doubtless used as a comb before combs were invented. How odd that he should not see that this is a reason for calling combs fingers, not fingers combs. With similar logic he suggests that *κλείς* in the sense of 'collar-bone' is prior to *κλείς* meaning 'key', and he quotes Demetrius, who denied that *κλείς*, 'collar-bone', was a metaphor at all. But what Demetrius meant was that, as the collar-bone *locks* the other bones at the base of the neck, it is as literally a *κλείς* as the instrument which locks a door.

Doubtless the subject is too large to be dealt with satisfactorily in 160 pages, but Mr. Stanford may not be mainly to blame for that. Still, he might have avoided relegating to a sketchy appendix a study of the figurative language of Aeschylus; and he should have corrected his proofs more carefully. Yet I will not end without saying that the book is full of separate good things and may be the foundation of a far better one, which Mr. Stanford is capable of writing.

J. A. K. THOMSON.

King's College, London.

OLD LATIN IN THE LOEB LIBRARY.

Remains of Old Latin, newly edited and translated by E. H. WARMINGTON. In three volumes. II. *Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Pacuvius and Accius*. Pp. xxviii + 674. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1936. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

MR. WARMINGTON has followed the plan of his first volume in bravely translating all the fragments of these four poets even when lack of a context makes translation both difficult and precarious. His translation of them is generally accurate, and he has spirited versions of some of the longer passages; but there are slips to be corrected. He

cites Nonius's perfectly sound distinction between *ferus* and *ferox* only to ignore it and translate *ferox* as 'fierce' or 'savage' five times and *ferocia* as 'ferocity' twice. *liquidum amnem* (p. 68) is not 'a liquid river'; *suo dat digito litteras* (p. 100: Naev. *Tar.*) is neither 'waves a message with her finger' nor 'gives a billet-doux from her own hand', but 'uses the lover's sign-language' (cf. Ov. *Am.* 2. 5. 18). *min salust?* (p. 138: Naev. *Romulus*) can hardly mean 'Is it safe for me?', and similar repartees in comedy (e.g. Pl. *Ps.* 45, 969) point to the meaning 'Have I the wherewithal *salutem dare?*'; and it

seems unsafe to translate *pro imperio agendum est* (p. 178: *Pac. Arm. Ind.*) as 'we must do according to command' in view of the official use of *pro imperio, pro magistratu*. On p. 421 the sense of a fragment of Accius is inverted by misconstruing a relative pronoun.

When he deals with the matrices in which the fragments are embedded, Mr. Warmington falls into more alarming errors: e.g. *polybrum . . . nos trulleum vocamus* (p. 26: *Non. 544. 20*), "*Polybrum*" . . . is a term we use for a wash-basin'; (*haec mala non inerant in eis quae tibi casus invexerat* (p. 260: *Cic. T.D. 3. 26*), 'There were among them none which accident had brought upon you'; *infans . . . est quod aut dici non debeat aut fari non possit* (p. 376: *Non. 55. 26*), 'something which ought not to be told or something which one cannot speak'; *servans sub imagine falcem* (p. 394: *Virg. A. 7. 179*), 'that keepest a curved sickle under thine image'; *possunt . . . cuiquam esse utiles angores?* (p. 570: *Cic. Off. 3. 84*), 'Can any man have a use for worry?'; *promicare extendere et porro iacere, unde emicare* (p. 78: *Non. 65. 4*), "*Promicare*", to extend . . .; whence "*emicare*" (which makes Nonius a fool; what he meant was 'from the same origin as "*emicare*"'). *testimonium iustum* (p. 154: *Gell. I. 24. 2*) is not 'a truthfulestimate' (which makes nonsense) but 'admissible evidence'; *metuit ne laceratis membris minus bene utatur* (p. 240: *Cic. T.D. I. 106*) is not 'lest his torn limbs be maltreated' but 'that he will not have the full use of his limbs after mangling', a piece of grim humour; *qui iam nusquam erant* (p. 386: *Cic. Planc. 59*) is not 'who after all never lived on earth' but 'who by that time were non-existent'. Worst of all, perhaps, is this (p. 95: *Fest. 268. 18*)—*cum post multos annos comoedi . . . personis uti coeperunt, verisimilius est . . .*, 'when after many years comic . . .

actors began to use masks, it is more likely that . . .', which shows indifference to both Latin and sense; Lindsay's *coeperint* is necessary—'since it was not till much later that . . .'

On p. 135 Mr. Warmington ascribes to Naevis the words *candor quum liquesceret* and adds the note '*quum ed. an. 1480*': true, but in an *ed. an. 1936* one hopes to see *quom*. It is hard to understand for whom the apparatus criticus is intended or what purpose is served by presenting the readings of all sorts of mss. of all sorts of authors without giving any information about their date or value. For Nonius this information was given in the preface to Vol. I, but the reader who wishes to make anything of the statement that in a passage of Isidore '*Bas. Par. Weilb.*' give one variant, '*Carol.*' another and '*Bern. Leid. Tolet. 2*' a third will have to go to Lindsay. On p. 14 we are summarily introduced to *Flor. of Varro*, on p. 40 to *Farn. L XVIII of Festus*, on p. 362 to *Tross. of Rhet. ad Her.*, and our Eyssenhardt will not help us to place the two Macrobian mss. cited on p. 80. On p. 64 Müller's *ut moenia* appears as *moenia ut*; on p. 228 the reading of P of Nonius is ascribed to Müller's conjecture; on p. 290 the Nonian ms. *Urbinas 307* is transformed into the scholar (so the type declares) *Urbinius*. *Ann. Phil.* (p. 107) is a strange way of referring to *N. Jahrb. f. Phil.* in an English note.

Mr. Warmington has studied very thoroughly what has been written on the fragments, their interpretation and their allocation, and has provided a useful conspectus of results. It is a pity that he did not avoid inaccuracies which will distress those who detect them and mislead those who do not; even of misprints there are enough to be annoying.

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

GREEK ORIGINALS OF LATIN COMEDIES.

W. E. J. KUIPER: *Grieksche Origineele en Latijnsche Navolgingen: Zes Komedies van Menander bij Terentius en Plautus*. Pp. viii+294. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandische Uitgevers-Maatschappij, 1936. Paper, fl. 8.

PROFESSOR Kuiper sets about his fascinating but dangerous enterprise in a thoroughly systematic manner. Confining himself to the six plays of Menander which are known to have served as models for extant Latin comedies, he tries

in each case to infer, from data supplied by the Latin versions, both the original form of the plot and the reasons for its modification. Thus he works on a sufficiently broad yet clearly defined basis. At the same time he has a clear grasp of the wider issues of the problem, and an exhaustive knowledge of the relevant literature.

If his approach is scholarly, his treatment is remarkably ingenious. As each loose thread is neatly rewoven to form a fresh pattern, one feels that Verrall's mantle is in wear again. Yet, although he is generally fair in argument and does not wilfully strain the facts, he sometimes passes too readily from premisses to conclusion; and his hypersensitivity to significance leads him to results which can hardly be reconciled with probability.

I select one play, the *Adelphi*, to illustrate his methods. Sostrata had been seduced in her youth by Demea. Simulus consented to marry her (in consideration of her dowry; complementary inference from 345-6) in spite of the expected child; but when twin girls were born he insisted that one should be exposed. This was Bacchis, who fell into the hands of a *leno*. Since the other daughter, Pamphila, was Simulus' child only in name, after his death Sostrata's brother (Hegio's counterpart; Donatus on 531) looked after their interests. The facts about Pamphila were discussed by Sostrata with Canthara when the latter returned with the midwife (as she must have done); the identity of Bacchis was established by a birth-token (a ring similar to that of Aeschinus, 347) which Micio finally traced to Demea. Thus the four young people were *ὁμοπάτριοι*. Since this relationship precluded marriage in Roman eyes, Terence had to cancel it.

This plot is economical, and highly attractive for the comic irony which it so freely provides. Yet (although this outline cannot do justice to the detailed

argument) the reconstruction rests on very slight grounds; and in spite of the ingenious explanation of Donatus' comment on 938 'apud Menandrum senex de nuptiis non grauatur,' I am not yet persuaded that the play ended with the righting of an old wrong by the marriage of Demea and Sostrata. Again, a theory which makes the indolent Micio a zealous and successful private detective, and attributes Demea's change of attitude to mere drunkenness, seems to destroy the ethical significance of the play.

Moreover, the argument *ex Donati silentio* still has weight. However incomplete, however partial in its purpose, however dull-witted the commentary of Donatus may be, it is our only direct evidence for Terence's alterations; and that it should note a few individual points which in themselves are of so little importance, and yet make no mention of fundamental changes in the plot, seems quite incomprehensible. Besides, if Terence departed so far from his original in both form and spirit, how could he justly retain the Greek titles for his plays? Such drastic cutting of the plots amounts to spoiling the whole dramatic artistry; it is certainly inconsistent with the interpretation of *dimidiate Menander* as 'Menander's other self'—Flickinger's strange view, which Professor Kuiper unexpectedly adopts in his introduction.

The case, then, may be regarded as not proven; but it does not follow that it is disproved, and further evidence may yet establish many of Kuiper's contentions. In any case the book should certainly be read by everyone who is interested in Graeco-Roman comedy. Those who have little Dutch will be encouraged when they hear that there is a short English summary at the end, while the excellent indices make it easy to refer to any particular point.

HUGH TREDENNICK.

Queen Mary College, London.

STUDIES IN QUINTILIAN.

Jean COUSIN: *Études sur Quintilien*.

Tome I: Contribution à la recherche des sources de l'*Institutio Oratoire*.

Tome II: Vocabulaire grec de la terminologie rhétorique dans l'*Institutio Oratoire*. Pp. 872, 151.

Paris: Boivin, 1936. Paper, 100 fr. and 25 fr.

THESE volumes are the first of a series in which M. Cousin proposes to repair the neglect that Quintilian has hitherto suffered. The work is needed, and it is good to see it undertaken on so ample a scale: but the bulk of M. Cousin's first volume must not lead us into overestimating its scope. In the strictly rhetorical books he has few precursors, and starts, therefore, from Quintilian's text, taking it, except in book I, chapter by chapter, noting parallels and references and commenting on the alignments of each section. Such a commentary is necessarily the first stage of the work: M. Cousin tries to give it literary continuity, and this part of the book is therefore largely taken up by a summary of the Latin, which serves as the object of his footnotes and interspersed remarks. One could wish that some of the space filled by this unprofitable paraphrase had been devoted to some major questions that the *Institutio Oratoria* raises in the history of rhetorical theory. This history M. Cousin expects one day to write: in the meantime it must be said that without it an account of Quintilian's sources is often superficial. The relation, in Quintilian and elsewhere, of the *partes orationis* to the *genera causarum* or the *partes rhetorices*, or that of the theory of *status* to the same; or the reason for which Quintilian brings under *dispositio* a mass of material normally allotted to *inventio*—these are very relevant to a treatise on his sources. To explain them is a complicated task: but M. Cousin has shown that he is not in principle afraid of treating his subject thoroughly.

M. Cousin describes the first half of the *Institutio Oratoria* as in general 'Stoic' or sometimes 'Hermagorean', the second half, except of course the

last book, as 'Theophrastean': and he points to the generally recognized intermediate sources. But he makes hardly any attempt to digest the piecemeal evidence for the use of various disputed sources such as Caecilius, Hermagoras, or even Aristotle. As a result he does not, for example, notice the confusion of the views attributed to Hermagoras, and assumes a direct use of him which has long been disproved. The good index goes some way to make up for this failing; and the book is bound to be valuable for the amount of material in it, though always wordy and often misleading or inaccurate. The comparative tables of *figures* in book IX should be particularly useful; and there is a very full bibliography.

The second part of the book contains three chapters with the headings *Orientalisation juridique*, *Orientalisation philosophique* and *Orientalisation rhétorique*. The first shows how much Quintilian's legal references are to Roman Law, how much to Greek; with a reference to the fanciful 'laws' postulated by declaimers. The second describes the influence of Stoicism, on which M. Cousin rightly insists, though sometimes to excess. He concludes that Quintilian's was a 'philosophic rhetoric'. More precision is needed. It is important that Quintilian, though Stoic notions rose readily to his mind, professed dislike and contempt for philosophy. Opposed to scholasticism, he is less a philosopher than a humanist. In the last and shortest chapter M. Cousin himself suggests this when he writes of Quintilian's relation to Cicero.

The second volume of the series lists all the Greek rhetorical terms that happen to occur in the *Institutio*, interprets them, cites the principal passages and refers to sources and parallels. This is useful: though terms with a complicated history such as *ἐνθύμημα* or *στάσις* are rather superficially treated, and elsewhere fewer words would have sufficed.

D. A. G. HINKS

Trinity College, Cambridge.

THE IMPERIAL PEACE.

The Cambridge Ancient History. Volume XI. *The Imperial Peace, A.D. 70-192.* Pp. xxvii+997; maps, plans, tables, etc. Cambridge: University Press, 1936. Cloth, 35s.

THE present volume carries the story of the Roman Empire from the restoration of constitutional government by Vespasian to the death of Commodus, when a revolution similar to that of the years 68-69 A.D. undermined the Principate that Augustus had established and heralded the birth of a military monarchy. The sub-title, 'The Imperial Peace', is not a misnomer. For, although the period was not devoid of wars, its essential characteristic was the consolidation of earlier conquests. The administrative machine was more perfectly adjusted to the needs of Empire; the frontiers were strengthened against barbarian attacks, and the provincials gradually promoted to a fuller share in the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship. If the output in art and literature was small, there was no lack of comfort and material prosperity.

The volume falls naturally into two parts. In the first the reign of each Emperor is treated separately, with additional chapters upon the civilization of Rome's most formidable enemies—the Dacians, Sarmatians and Parthians—and upon the growth of Christianity within the Empire. In the second part two chapters on the Constitution and Romanization, both excellently presented by Professor Last, lead to a detailed survey of the provinces, and the volume concludes with an account of Literature, Art and the development of Roman Law. This arrangement is not without its disadvantages. In particular, exception may be taken to the late position in the volume of the chapter on the Constitution (Chapter X). The significance of the Flavians cannot be appreciated without a proper understanding of their constitutional powers, and Mr. Charlesworth's opening chapter suffers, to a greater extent than it would have done if it had been preceded by Professor Last's, by the omission of this

very important aspect of the Flavian Dynasty.

In a short review detailed criticism is impossible, and I shall confine myself to some general considerations and a few particular comments.

Among the earlier chapters Mr. Syme's detailed treatment of the wars on the Rhine and Danube does not belie the expectations raised by his contributions to Volume X, even if he is, perhaps deliberately, blind to some of the defects of his hero Domitian. Mr. Longden has given us a clear picture of Trajan's rule and a balanced account of Nerva's administration, steering a judicious course between the traditional flattery and the recent vituperation of that aged gentleman. On the other hand Professor Weber's chapters on Hadrian and the Antonines are disappointing. Much space that is devoted to a description of their personal characteristics might have profitably been employed in a more substantial account of their administrative reforms at home and abroad. Too much is surely made of the Iberian strain in their blood, and the portrait of Commodus reads like romance rather than history. The chapters suffer too from the style in which they are written, and the following examples suggest that it is not the translator who is at fault.

Of Hadrian Professor Weber says (p. 306), 'His despotic striving towards the divine in all the world, the self-enhancement of his mysterious power, its setting forth for show in the image of the highest god of the Greeks and Romans, tokens of his intoxicating illusionism, offspring of his mystically dark imaginings, like his restless sweeping around the world, dissipated themselves at last in an outbreak of insanity'; and of Commodus he writes (p. 392), 'A Spanish visionary, mystical, handsome, pliant, strong, now lively now indolent, now intrepid now a coward . . . a notable creature, he was in everything extreme, in obedience towards God, in power to take divinity on himself, in wild sensuality, in iron fearlessness, in animal passion.' And there are many

other sentences in the same vein, obsecrity vying with redundancy.

The later chapters on the provinces are unequal in quality and in interest. Unstinted praise may be given to Dr. Cumont and Professor Collingwood for their accounts of the Eastern Provinces and of Britain respectively. Professor Albertini's section on Spain seems, on the contrary, somewhat ill-proportioned; it is at least regrettable that he gives no considered discussion of Vespasian's grant of Latin rights, surely a notable landmark in the history of that province. Again, Dr. Bell's section on Egypt, as he himself admits, would have found a more suitable place in the next volume, while Crete and Cyrenaica in this period hardly merit the space that the editor has allotted them. Lastly, Dr. Streeter's chapter on Christianity, which is placed somewhat strangely in the volume between the chapters on Trajan and Hadrian, gives a most valuable account of the internal life of the Church, but omits to notice the policy of the Antonines towards it.

I append a few points of more particular criticism. In Chapter I, in view of the controversial nature of the evidence, a paragraph might well have been devoted to the growth of the Imperial cult. The occasion of the increase of the soldiers' pay is differently dated on p. 29, n. 2, and on p. 133, n. 1. On p. 220 the title *procurator a loricata* needs explanation. The change made by Vespasian in the recruitment of the legions is attributed by Professor Last (p. 376) to political reasons; a more probable explanation is to be found in the superior and more plentiful material that the provinces could now supply and in the declining population of

Italy. The same author (p. 472) regards the provincial *concilia* of the West as political rather than religious in origin, but more evidence than he produces is required before this interesting opinion can command conviction. It is surely misleading to give the impression (p. 529) that colonization was a method of extending Roman citizenship to 'insufficiently romanized provincials'. On p. 670 it is suggested by one writer that Roman colonies had special financial privileges, although such a view of the status of the colony has earlier been repudiated by another contributor (pp. 454-5). Is there sufficient evidence to justify the statement (p. 550) that the Moesian legionaries of the first century A.D. were 'largely drawn from Oriental peoples'? The importance of Sirmium as a military centre is emphasized by Professor Alföldi, who adds rightly that Marcus Aurelius stayed there for long periods during the Marcomannic and Sarmatian Wars (p. 548); it is curious then that in his detailed account of these years of warfare Professor Weber (pp. 349 ff.) should not even have mentioned the city. The maps, with the exception of that of Cyrenaica, which looks rather naked, are clear and detailed, and the bibliography is satisfying and comprehensive.

In short, Volume XI, if it does not uniformly maintain the high standard set by its two immediate predecessors, provides us with a wealth of material for the better understanding of Roman imperialism. Apart from its unwieldy size it is for the most part a pleasant enough book to read and enjoy.

H. M. D. PARKER.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

POMPEII.

Pompeii, by R. C. CARRINGTON. Pp. xii + 197; 21 figures, 24 plates, 1 folding plan. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

THIS very delightful book ably fills a long-felt want. Hitherto, the English student of Pompeii has depended upon guide-books written in, or translated from, another language, or upon the local *cicerone*, whose characteristics re-

quire no description. Mr. Carrington's aim is to provide a scholarly statement of the history and environment of the remains, followed by a detailed selective description of their principal features. An appendix suggests an itinerary among the ruins themselves for those who actually visit the site. He has entirely succeeded in his task. We have no doubt that the book will be an

incentive to visitors: but we can also welcome it as a clear description of the town suitable for all who would know that corner of the Roman world without necessarily expecting to visit it.

Much credit must be given to the author for his arrangement of the very complicated material. The work opens with an account of the eruption which made the town famous, and the excavations made possible by the eruption. Then follows an interesting description of the country-side, combined with a history of the development of the town, told from its planning, its fortifications and political history. There is controversial material here, but Mr. Carrington presents the case simply and fairly, without taking sides. Municipal and public life, closely linked with amenities and amusements, is discussed in the next section. It is noteworthy how much detail is included without overloading the text, and the contrasts are well made. The chapter on town-houses is even more instructive, showing how the original type of house, centred about an *atrium*, was modified by new needs and fashions, until it became an elaborate establishment with other centres of interest. Country-houses and farms are also treated in such a way that their economic function is properly displayed.

After reading these sections, no one will ever be deluded again by the travesty of Pompeii and its activities in a famous world-history. This leads naturally to a discussion of trade and commerce, in which the forum, its markets for food and cloth, and its exchange for trade and for administration of law take the leading place. The cults reveal, in the next chapter, interesting relations between the local deities and those of the Roman colony, while the gods of trade and the innumerable spirits of street and household fill in the background. Imported cults had not made a deep impression: only that of Isis had taken a prominent place, though the ubiquitous Jew has left traces of his presence. Whether the scrawled comparison of Pompeii with Sodom and Gomorrah is necessarily a Christian sentiment may be open to doubt. The work closes with a useful section on the art and architecture, which is full of good things well said. Though short, it will give the student of Pompeii an excellent idea of the standards of taste in a world where a wide extension of comfort had blunted the finer edges of criticism and perception.

I. A. RICHMOND.

Armstrong College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

ROMAN BRITAIN AND THE ENGLISH SETTLEMENTS.

R. G. COLLINGWOOD and J. N. L. MYRES: *Roman Britain and the English Settlements*. Pp. xxvi + 515; 10 Maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

THIS is a brilliant book. Its 'two independent studies of two distinct though interlocking subjects', forming the first volume of the Oxford History of England, not only lay the best possible foundation but set an exemplary standard for the series. Yet we must not be dazzled. In particular, the combination of clarity of style and resoluteness of opinion that characterise Professor Collingwood's exposition may give a sense of finality which the author would be the first to deprecate. Field-work is no longer even seasonal: material quickly gathers, and this book

by its very excellence will call for revision.

In 1930 Professor Collingwood in the Preface to his *Archaeology of Roman Britain* emphasised the comparative inaccessibility of so much of the technical material which he there attempted to correlate in manageable form. The result was 'strictly a handbook of archaeology, not an history'. His present contribution, therefore, is in a very different class, as even on casual handling the sober absence of illustration (unfamiliar in Romano-British studies) and the scattered maps suggest. Here is a historical account of Roman Britain, viewed throughout not, as we are accustomed, from the Roman but rather from the British side—an attempt 'to reconstruct the

state of the country and of its peoples and to determine how far these altered and how far they remained the same'. The opening chapters, not only by their content but more by their omissions, afford instructive contrast with Rice Holmes. Professor Collingwood, declining any lengthy discussion—unprofitable in the present state of our knowledge—of British pre-history, sets the stage for the Caesarian invasions in thirty pages and gives a critical account of the invasions themselves which is a model of its kind. There follows a survey of Belgic and non-Belgic kingdoms before A.D. 43. Here some may desire more emphasis on the change of the dynastic capital to Colchester (p. 58) and its implications: more will certainly regret the absence of a distribution map of pre-Claudian coinage, a valuable aid which could, if necessary, have replaced Map III, which seems a luxury at least reducible to a scale approximating to that of IVa. From the Claudian invasion the story moves forward rapidly. But at the Tyne-Solway line there comes a check, for here the author wrestles afresh with the spectre of the *vallum*, which, far from exorcised by Bede's euphemistic description of something which does not in fact exist, persists in haunting. *Σοφὸς παλαιστῆς κείνος*. Time will show whether the suggestion (cf. *C.A.H.* XI, p. 524, but here discussed in greater detail) that the *vallum* represents a customs-barrier separately controlled by the financial procurator, will stand firm, or in isolation, as excavation proceeds. The Rev. John Skinner's meditation on Housesteads, as he tramped the Wall almost at the heels of his abler contemporary William Hutton, is still applicable to the whole frontier—'Surely there must be as much scope here for the antiquarian as any place in the kingdom'.

To point out that perhaps only in discussing the Antonine Wall has Professor Collingwood clearly misinterpreted his evidence is to praise the high standard of accuracy elsewhere. But neglect of the stone-foundation

invalidates his depreciation of a work the constructional methods of which, though undoubtedly economical, yet afforded both literally and metaphorically the height of efficiency.

The third main section is one of the most striking of the book. Examining in detail the machinery of government, population, town and country life, industry, commerce, art and religion, Professor Collingwood by his handling as much as by the wealth of his material produces a unique study of a completeness hitherto unavailable. The discussion of urban and country life and of agriculture in particular forms a real contribution to the social and economic history of the province, and includes the interesting suggestion that the villa-system is an adaptation of a pre-Roman system of land tenure and cultivation. Further examination of villa-sites may well confirm this.

In the brief account of the decline and the evacuation, most notable are the author's recantation of views published fifteen years ago and his insistence on an extent of Roman occupation after the rescript of Honorius which only those sharing his views of the *Notitia* will find acceptable. And what of Arthur, who for Professor Collingwood, as once for Guinevere, wears no 'golden symbol of his kinglihood,' but rationalised as the intelligent son of good romanised lowland stock, knowing the value of heavy cavalry against unmounted invaders, now organises and leads a mobile field-army of *cataphrattarii*?

Of Mr. Myres's contribution, briefer but fully worthy of such strenuous partnership, we need only notice here the careful examination of the difficult problem of 'survival'. His answer is negative—'of the characteristic institutions of Roman Britain neither the towns nor the villas survived in any significant sense'.

G. CLEMENT WHITTICK.

Armstrong College,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

GREEK METRE.

W. J. W. KOSTER: *Traité de Métrique Grecque. Suivi d'un Précis de Métrique Latine*. Pp. ii+328. Leyden: Sijthoff, 1936. Paper, fl. 8 (cloth, 9).

MR. KOSTER has performed a welcome service in surveying the whole field of Greek metric and producing a concise and useful treatise, written with admirable clarity, and supplemented by a précis (pp. 42) of Latin metric which is a model of its kind. The earlier chapters contain a historical summary with a short bibliography of metrical studies, a section on prosody, and an account of the general nature of Greek metres in which the author associates himself decisively with the growing number of scholars who reject dynamic ictus as a constitutive element in the verse-rhythms of classical Greek. The little we know of Greek music in its relation to metric is also discussed, with conclusions perhaps pressed incautiously far. The bulk of the work is an analysis of metrical phenomena classed under the various 'feet'—dactyl, iamb, cretic, 'mixed,' etc.—with a final section on the structure of poems.

The treatise is systematic, not discursive, and some of the most interesting and essential problems of lyric metre are inevitably excluded by the choice of method. It would be unprofitable for a reviewer to record a bare disagreement with certain statements, such as that there are only two types of ionic cola *a maiore*, or (p. 140) that Simon. fr. 32B is anapaestic; and on the notions of 'anacrusis' and 'hypercatalexis' in general there is truceless war between rival schools of thought. The question may legitimately be raised, however, whether some less mechanical form of classification might not have been more enlightening. The table on p. 20, with some of the elements subsequently taken out as hypothetical or exceptional, the procedure by size—tripody, dim. cat., dim., dim. hypercat., pentapody, etc.—are superficially clear, but have more to do with ancient Greek metricians than with Greek metric. The whole conception of (e.g.)

the iamb as a 'foot' \cup —which 'when there are an even number' works in pairs will of course set many teeth on edge; as soon define the ionic as pyrrhic+spondee. Such a 'foot' as a 'constitutive element' of aeolic cola is a formal abstraction; it is just as true, and as meaningless, to say that (e.g.) $---\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup\cup-\cup$ ends on a cretic or starts with a molossus. 'Tripodies' and 'pentapodies' are simply 'rare'; it should surely have been mentioned that their actual existence is contested. Their variations are even more bewildering; $\theta\alpha\lambda\alpha\mu\eta\pi\acute{o}\lambda\omega\ \pi\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ becomes an iambic tripod with anapaestic opening, the enigmatic $-\cup-\cup-$ a 'trochaic tripod catalectic'; and when P.V. 553-4 is split into an 'anapaestic tripod' $+ \cup\cup-\cup-|\cup--\wedge$ in which 'the anapaest is a secondary form of the iamb' the foundations of sane colometry are sapped. The main trouble arises partly from treating the highly individual 'dactylo-epitrite' metres as divisible into cola as rigid as any stichic lengths, partly from an overstraining of the argument from context: thus in phrases which look pherecratean or dochmiac K. detects (pp. 115-6) 'anapaestic monometers hypercatalectic' because 'les côla qui les entourent n'autorisent que l'analyse par anapestes.' But metres of different type occur often enough in juxtaposition precisely because their movement is similar enough to carry forward the rhythm uninterrupted. K. also indulges the notion of anacalasis to a point where it performs feats of transformation as remarkable as those of the old anacrusis (cf. pp. 102-6); e.g., P.V. 695, which might appear a dochmiac dimeter or an iamb. trim. cat., becomes a 'trochaic pentapody with anacalasis,' and Eur. *Tro.* 560 ff. is represented as a whole series of 'anacalastic lecythia' in order to save K.'s conception of the unvarying nature of iambic protraction deduced from musical evidence.

Disputable points involving textual criticism are mostly excluded by the scope of the treatise, but metrical illustrations resting upon highly dubious emendations might better have been

avoided, e.g. (p. 194) *O.C.* 680 *θεαῖς* is rejected as a solecism by most scholars, and (p. 128) *K.* appears not to have noticed that his 'parémiaque de forme ordinaire' *Pers.* 938 owes its existence to an emendation designed to force the line into rough responsion with the antistrophe, which shows a paroemiac of a shape inadmissible on *K.*'s own formulas.

It is surprising to find *K.* (p. 62 ff.) approving such an explanation as Goodell's and wholly rejecting Fraenkel's on a subsidiary point of terminology. The *ῥυθμικοί* are surely theorizing from the empirical quantities of rhapsodic elocution to conventional musical quantity: knowing that in *marching* anapaests = $\cup \cup$ with absolute strictness they fall back on those 'anapaests' (not constructed in syzygies with diaeresis; cf. their example quoted) which in

movement are distinguishable from 'dactyls' only by 'taking off' from the short syllables, i.e. *ἀντίστροφον* refers to the phenomenon known as *ἐπιπλοκή*. Cf. *Ar. Av.* 451 ff., *Soph. Trach.* 510.

Greek metric is a controversial subject, and to scholars of Mr. Koster's own persuasion much of the foregoing criticism may appear valid only as a record of disagreement. Of the much larger measure of agreement a review cannot speak in detail, and the usefulness of the book as a work of reference is beyond question. Slips are few: (1) p. 127, there is no '*syllaba anceps*' in this reading of *Supp.* 13 (*M* has *ἐπέκρᾱν*); (2) p. 189, *Ant.* 339, for *ἀκάματον* read *ἀκαμάταν*; (3) p. 293, 'ithyphaliques' should be 'lecythia'.

A. M. DALE.

Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.

A SKETCH OF HOUSMAN.

A. S. F. Gow: *A. E. Housman*. A sketch, together with a list of his writings and an index to his classical papers. Pp. xiii + 137; 3 illustrations. Cambridge: University Press, 1936. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

HOUSMAN has made the task of his biographer hard, as in life by a studied reticence and remoteness, so in death by the inevitable memory of a spirit which sought truth passionately and could not rest short of perfection. Mr. Gow's sketch is a piece of work of which he might have approved; at any rate, it is worthy of him. There is no exposure of privacy, no idle speculation, but a straightforward account of Housman's career and an impression, conveyed with a sensitive touch and a delicate economy of language, of Housman as he lived and thought, which will appeal to those who, knowing the scholar, feel the need for a picture of the man. It is well that posterity should have a faithful likeness of that proud and lonely figure, thwarted in life, though not in scholar-

ship, by the standards he set himself, that tangle (as he seems) of contraries, driven to deny himself what he most desired, building his own monument among men against 'the fall of night' and yet contemptuous of human judgement and mistrustful of man's destiny. Such a likeness is here set down by one who is qualified, as few were, to draw it; the result is a masterpiece in one of the most difficult of arts.

To his service of piety to the greatest of English latinists Mr. Gow has added a service to all those who pursue the studies in which he led. The list of Housman's writings is useful in itself; even more useful are the accompanying indexes to his published classical papers, one an index locorum, the other an index of topics. The care which has gone to the making of them has provided a tool of scholarship for which all students of Latin must be grateful.

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

THREE BOOKS OF COMPOSITIONS.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE: *Balliol and Edinburgh Compositions*. Pp. iv+135. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

J. B. POYNTON: *Versions*. Pp. 195. Oxford: Blackwell, 1936. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

I. F. SMEDLEY: *Greek and Latin Compositions*. Pp. xi+116. Cambridge: University Press, 1936. Cloth, 5s.

IN these days, a Latin speech is more common from a Vice-Chancellor than a Latin prose; as for Greek, οὐδὲ γὰρ. But while Dr. Pickard-Cambridge's book is a vice-cancellarian novelty, and as such possesses a certain Olympian air, it contains many old acquaintances that will come as a delight to his pupils at Balliol and at Edinburgh—a κτήμα ἐς αἰῶνα to correct their often rueful memories of their own ἀγωνίσματα ἐς τὸ παραχρῆμα. The author has clearly enjoyed his work; though fortunately not yet otiosus himself, he might well echo Quintilian's words 'quando praeicipiendi munus iam pridem deprecatus sumus . . . inquirendo scribeoque talia consolemur otium nostrum, quae futura usui bonae mentis iuvenibus arbitramur, nobis certe voluptati'.

The Greek translations are admirable. Here is lucid, enviable Platonic writing; elsewhere, Pitt, Burke and Grattan make noble Attic orators, and Curzon would have relished his own metamorphosis. The passages, though difficult, are all properly akin to Greek; but where necessary, the composer can treat Worcestershire sauce or female gorillas as felicitously as he can deal with ossifrant theories or with the Heavenly Jerusalem. These versions are living Greek.

In the Latin pieces, a certain brilliant obscurity occasionally results from the choice of such passages as De Quincey on the Earth's age, surely too fanciful for a Latin dress. The author's ingenuity is sometimes misplaced: Naevius scarcely fits Gower in the context on p. 118, nor is Tiro really at home on p. 113; yet many of the allusions are delightfully apposite. There are certain stylistic lapses; for example, *eructatio* is curious in a classical piece, *callidus*

with the infinitive unlikely in anything but Tacitean prose; *saporem nullam* (p. 123) and *motum . . . obruturam* (p. 95) are obvious misprints, but what of *eventurum fuisset* (p. 95), a puzzling use of *prae* (p. 99), *stragulae* (p. 103), *non sine acerbitatis aliquantulo* (p. 127)? Taken as a whole, these Latin versions have not the spontaneous reality of the Greek compositions, although there is much in them also that one cannot but envy and whole-heartedly admire. An index is badly needed, and the elegant work of the Clarendon Press is marred by several misprints (including an *erratum* in the list of *errata*).

Dr. Pickard-Cambridge's book will appeal most to seasoned scholars and to teachers of advanced prose composition; Mr. Poynton also will win their admiration, but perhaps his greatest service is done to younger students. Everywhere he demonstrates quietly but insistently the true meaning of *oeconomia* in composition, and nothing better could be given to the sixth-form boy or the undergraduate with a receptive mind and a feeling for artistry. The passages are difficult yet not tortuous, ingenious yet not improbable. The proses in either language are models of taste and style; in a short review the verses demand most attention. Mr. Poynton is no eccentric, and I have rarely read such natural verses as his, more especially his Latin elegiacs; he includes also some polished Latin lyrics and Greek elegiacs. The beautiful Latin hexameter version of the dialogue between Lorenzo and Jessica ('In such a night') evokes a special *σοφῶς*; it contrasts curiously and instructively with Verrall's rendering in *Cambridge Compositions*. Humpty Dumpty in iambs is amusing—a far cry this to *Arundines Cami*. How A. D. Godley would have rejoiced at this evidence that verse composition is still vigorous! Winchester was fortunate to recover Mr. Poynton from Corpus.

A few small points for criticism occur. *Multo* with a superlative (p. 69) might mislead a young student; *culpae* and *durare* (pp. 85, 137) are unsuitable for Ciceronian prose; the form *excelluerit*

(p. 153) is hardly admissible; *volutare* is strangely applied to Sisyphus rolling his stone (p. 185). The reference to Anytus on p. 121 escapes me, and *τοὺς φιλητάς λεγομένους* ('Burkers', p. 131) is a little mysterious. There are a few misprints, chiefly in accents and breathings.

I. F. Smedley, *anima candida et amabilis* as the tablet to his memory in Westminster School portrays him, was a composer in the high Salopian tradition, and many more than his friends and former pupils will be glad to have the selection from his work now published. His book forms an effective foil to the two already noticed; in general it is more sober and conservative in scope, reflecting a clear contrast between two schools of thought; it too will be of great service to teachers both in schools and in Universities. Mr. Smedley's best work seems to me to lie in the field of Greek prose. Here his choice of passages is mainly historical and philosophical, and he shows himself an adept in Thucydidean Greek, with a meticulously analytical mind, a master of balance, antithesis, and economy of words. In Latin his philosophical and

oratorical styles are alike vigorous and attractive. I do not feel quite the same power behind his verses; they are conscientious rather than inspired, and read more like the conventional 'fair copy', yet here too there are some admirable touches. His Greek iambs tend to be obscure, but there is some stichomuthia with an authentic ring; he is perhaps over-fond of translating Milton, who so seldom looks natural in Latin. But in general, his verses, like all his prose, show a fine feeling for correct and sensitive expression. There is little room for detailed criticism; but *comite aves pinnas* (p. 63) strikes me as odd, and *ceu* is surely inadmissible in elegiacs (p. 69); on p. 3 the expression *τοῦ διὰ ζῶης/πόθου* seems harsh, especially when divided between two lines. But these are carping remarks; for Mr. Smedley's book is a worthy memorial of and to a fine scholar.

All three collections are pleasurable proof that the English tradition of pure scholarship has not yet been entirely sacrificed to the Moloch of 'Research'.

R. G. AUSTIN.

University of Glasgow.

SOME CLASS-BOOKS.

- * 1. W. W. EWBank: *First Year Latin*. Pp. xviii+234. London: Longmans, 1936. Cloth, 2s. 9d.
 2. Dora Pym: *Salve per Saecula*. Pp. 109. London: Harrap, 1936. Cloth, 2s.
 3. M. KEAN: *Penultima Latina*. Pp. viii+108. London: Blackie, 1936. Cloth, 1s. 3d.
 4. C. M. FIDDIAN: *A First Latin Course*. Pp. xii+180. London: Martin Hopkinson, 1936. Cloth, 3s.
 5. L. W. P. LEWIS and L. M. STYLER: *A Book of Latin Translation*. Pp. viii+239. London: Heinemann, 1937. Cloth, 3s.
 6. H. D. BROADHEAD: *Exules Siberiani*. Pp. 47. Auckland and London: Whitcombe and Tombs, 1932. Paper.
- *The value of many otherwise admirable text-books is vitiated, in my opinion, by the introduction of two principles both fundamentally unsound. In order

to create "interest" far too much matter is inserted, and the pupil is unable to see the wood for the trees, whilst the book defeats its own object, namely, a rapid comprehension of the elementary rules of grammar and syntax. Secondly, in a laudable attempt to make the work easy (and *ipso facto*, deadly dull) the authors allow their exercises to degenerate into a concoction of nonsense as insulting to the Romans as it is humiliating to the intelligence of the pupils.' Thus Mr. Ewbank in the preface to his thorough and well-illustrated book, which avoids both the errors to which he refers. Mrs. Pym's book seems to fall into the first. It includes pieces of Tacitus, Pliny and Suetonius, authors surely too hard for pupils who are in their second year of Latin and still need a foot-note to explain the use of *ut* final. Her enterprising extracts from Prudentius, the Vulgate, Alcuin

Josef
Pr
H
M
THIS
a ve
mean
gation
(part
Arist
the g
as he
of L
exam
are d
to co
these
tenth
rates
not vi
Wa
the id
the fo
and L
For e
tivos,
statist
It is,
shoul
to all
style.

and Radbod are easier, but inevitably swell a vocabulary with words which would only cumber a beginner's mind, such as *fragratus, impinguo, trinsio, rubeus* (red). The vocabulary itself is defective, and no quantities are marked. But it is an entertaining anthology, suitable for quick reading by post-Certificate pupils.

Mr. Kean calls his book 'A Latin Companion for Middle Forms'. It is not clear on what principle the grammatical topics are introduced. On page 1 we have the two Supines followed by Ablative Absolute and the Gerund. Then come the Cases, ending with the Ablative on page 9. Here we are told in section I that *potior, utior, fungor, fruor* take the Ablative. 'Call these verbs the "puff-verbs"'. We then pass to the Verb, beginning with Inceptives. The editor rightly draws attention to English words derived from Latin; but in a book of this size it seems disproportionate to print fifteen 'exercises' taken from Jane Austen and other authors, merely to give the pupil a chance of picking out Latin derivatives.

Mr. Fiddian's book is the best in the

batch. It is accurate and thorough, and has the great merit of teaching the meaning of subject, object, etc., by numerous examples in English before getting on to Latin. The sentences, though formed from the vocabulary of Caesar and Ovid, are less remote from ordinary life than those in the old-fashioned Primers, which were filled, as the author says, with 'vague, ethical sentiments and still more vague military operations.' A book to be warmly recommended.

Messrs. Lewis and Styler have produced another sound and dependable book of easy pieces for translation from Latin.

Exules Siberiani is an abridged Latin rendering of a French story, 'La jeune Sibérienne'. The Latin is good. The rather sad little story of a young girl, who obtains a pardon from the Czar for her exiled parents and then enters a Convent to die, is thought by the author likely to grip the minds of 'growing youths' more quickly than the narratives of Livy or Caesar.

J. T. CHRISTIE.

Repton.

JOSEF WALZ: *Der lysianische Epitaphios*. Pp. 55. (*Philologus* Supplementband XXIX, Heft 4.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1936. Paper, M. 3.60.

THIS article, based on a dissertation of 1930, is a very able and scholarly piece of work. By means of a thorough and discriminating investigation of the internal and external evidence (particularly the reference in the third book of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*) Walz convincingly indicates the genuineness of the speech, which is marked, as he points out, by many of the characteristics of Lysias, his vividness in description, for example. Divergences from L's normal style are due to the epideictic nature of the work: and to condemn the *Epitaphios* on the strength of these divergences involves condemning the tenth and fourteenth speeches as well. Isocrates' *Panegyricus* presupposes the *Epitaphios*, not vice versa.

Walz shows that in a great number of cases the idiom of the *Epitaphios* agrees with that of the forensic speeches of L. and the *Olympiacus* and *Eroticus*, and differs from that of Isocrates. For example, L. always writes ἀκολουθεῖν μετὰ τινος, Isocrates always συνακολουθεῖν τινι. These statistics are really conclusive by themselves. It is, as Walz says, incredible that someone should have copied Isocrates, and yet held fast to all these minute characteristics of Lysianic style.

Walz holds that the speech was actually delivered in 392 or 391 B.C., probably by L. himself. There is no definite evidence that a resident alien could not deliver a funeral speech.

In the course of his argument Walz makes some general observations of interest: as when he compares the various methods of treating mythical and historical material in the extant funeral speeches. His estimate of the literary merits of L's *Epitaphios* is higher than most people's.

J. D. DENNISTON.

Hertford College, Oxford.

Aristophanes and the Pnyx. By James Turney ALLEN. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. XII, No. 2, pp. 27-34.) Berkeley: University of California Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1936. Paper, 1s. 3d.

THE author sets out to prove (1) That the *bema* is nowhere in Aristophanes designated as *πέτρα* (in spite of the Schol. on *Knights* 956), since in *Knights* 313 ἀπὸ τῶν πετρῶν ἀνωθεν τοὺς φόρους θυννοσκοπῶν and in *Knights* 956 λάρος κεχρηῖως ἐπὶ πέτρας δημηγορῶν the words ἀπὸ τῶν πετρῶν and ἐπὶ πέτρας are part of the figure. This may be accepted without accepting also the writer's interpretation of some of the supposedly parallel passages which he cites.

(2) That the People in the Assembly did not sit on the bare rock. He does prove that there were some wooden seats in Aristophanes' time, but I doubt if he proves that there were enough to render untenable the natural interpretation of *Knights* 783 ἐπὶ ταῖσι πέτραις οὐ φροντίζει σκληρῶς σε καθήμενον οὕτως, viz. that the People generally had nothing but the hard ground to sit upon.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

University of Sheffield.

Eine Handelsrede aus der Zeit des Demosthenes. Die Rede XXXIV gegen Phormion, mit Einleitung und Sachkommentar herausgegeben von E. ZIEBARTH. Pp. xi + 35. Heidelberg: Winter, 1936. Paper, M. 1.20.

THIS is an unpretentious but very valuable little book. The introduction gives in brief compass a masterly *aperçu* of the Athenian corn-trade, its shipowners and merchant-adventurers. Ziebarth is not primarily interested in the Greek text. The apparatus is good enough so far as it goes. Once or twice he accepts a supplement without indicating its source. In Hyp. § 4 he retains the MS. ἀποδιδόναι without accepting Blass's consequent deletion of τοῦτο. But his notes on the subject-matter are illuminating. They show a remarkable familiarity, to be expected from the author of *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Seeraubs und Seehandels im alten Griechenland*, with the inscriptional evidence, with the speeches of the Attic Orators, and with the work of modern scholarship. On one or two points I may enter a caveat:

§ 1: 'ἐν τῷ μέρει λεγόντων d.h. abwechselnd nämlich Chrysippos und sein Bruder.' But surely this would be ἐν μέρει. The reference is to the preceding speech of Phormion—'as we reply.'

§ 5: Ziebarth deduces from μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων παίδων (§ 10) that Lampis was himself a slave. It does not follow. Leisi, *Der Zeuge* p. 25, draws the same conclusion from the use of οἰκέτης, which always means a slave elsewhere in Demosthenes. I believe with Lipsius, *Att. Recht*, p. 797, n. 28, that Lampis was a freedman.

§ 20: 'πρὸς τοῦτον: wer ist gemeint? Doch wohl Phormion und nicht Theodotos.' Neither the one nor the other. Phormion had not reached Athens when the interview of § 17 took place. That the statement was made to Chrysippos is confirmed by the parallel language of § 35: ὅσα μὲν εἶπε πρὸς ἐμὲ πρὶν ὑπὸ τούτου διαφθαρήναι οὐκ ἐνός ὧν αὐτοῦ φησὶν εἰπεῖν.

Ziebarth's summing up (where, by the way, we should surely read 'Chrysippos' for 'Phormion' (p. 30, l. 2) and for 'Lampis' (p. 30, l. 3)) is particularly lively and acute. It amply explains the embarrassment of the luckless arbitrator.

W. RENNIE.

University of Glasgow.

Eleuterio ELORDUY: *Die Sozialphilosophie der Stoa*. (Philologus, Suppl. XXVIII 3.) Pp. xii + 268. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1936. Paper, M. 13.50 (bound, 15).

DR ELORDUY, who is a Spaniard, includes much in his book which would not be suggested by the title, notably discussions of the Stoic views on free will, change, the categories, the

final conflagration, and personality. The title is also insufficient because there is a considerable element in his material which is not Stoic but pure fancy. Thus we are told that an example of a 'corporeal and immaterial' thing is the 'extra-cosmic Logos'. The non-existent Centaur may be corporeal, for he is 'wirkungs-fähig'. Ariston is said to have denied any intervention of Fate in the decisions of the will, which he believed to be endowed with a power he called δόναμις ἐπελευστική. The Stoic paradoxes are said not to have been developed before the general public.

Perhaps my attention is too much distracted by bricks of such a peculiar nature, but I must confess that Dr Elorduy's construction is for me a labyrinth to which I have not found the clue.

F. H. SANDBACH.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

H. I. BELL: *Recent Discoveries of Biblical Papyri*. Pp. 30. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937. Sewed, 2s.

DR BELL'S inaugural lecture as Honorary Reader in Papyrology at Oxford very properly begins with a tribute to the memory of Grenfell and Hunt, followed by an earnest appeal for volunteers to help in building on the foundations which they laid.

The main body of the lecture is an account of recent finds of biblical papyri, and of some of the very important conclusions that follow from these discoveries. It is a masterly exposition, in which a vast amount of valuable information is simply and clearly conveyed in a remarkably small space. Of many interesting points raised reference may be made to two. The first is the type of text offered by the LXX papyri. Dr Bell points out that here we find a tendency to side with A rather than B: this is marked in P. Ryl. Gk. 458 (ii/B.C.) for Deuteronomy, in P. Baden 56 (ii/A.D.) for Exodus, and in Beatty Papyrus VI (ii/A.D.) for Deuteronomy. We may add that this puts the O.T. quotations of the Epistle to the Hebrews in a new light, for they also conform to the A type of text, a fact which may well have important bearings both on the history of the LXX text and on the problem of the origin of the Epistle. The second point of special interest is the discussion (pp. 17-22) of the problems raised by the fragments of a hitherto unknown Gospel (P. Egeron 2), particularly its relation to the canonical Gospels and its bearing upon the date of John. Dr Bell now accepts the view that the new fragments are part of a work composed before the end of the first quarter of the second century by an author who knew the Fourth Gospel. The importance of this conclusion—fortified by the existence of P. Ryl. Gk. 457—for the dating of the Fourth Gospel can hardly be over-emphasized. (On p. 17, l. 27, for 'third' read 'second'.)

There are many other matters of great interest and moment in this valuable summary, which must be gratefully received and warmly commended to all who are interested in papyrology or biblical criticism or both.

T. W. MANSON.

University of Manchester.

ΠΑΡΑΤΕΙΣ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ. Acta Pauli. Nach dem Papyrus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek unter Mitarbeit von Wilhelm Schubart herausgegeben von Carl SCHMIDT. Pp. viii+132; 12 photographs. Hamburg: Augustin, 1936. Cardboard, RM. 8 (cloth, 10).

IN 1929 Carl Schmidt announced the discovery of a papyrus containing fragments of the lost Greek original of the apocryphal *Acts of Paul*. At long last these fragments have been made available for scholars. The work now before us is a truly beautiful specimen of scholarly editing, with acute reconstruction of the text—for this Dr Schubart has been primarily responsible—and learned critical excursuses, mainly by Dr Schmidt. It is a delight to follow the ingenuity with which Schmidt uses every scrap of evidence to reconstruct the scope of the Romance as a whole. The eleven pages of Greek text now recovered contain fragments of five episodes which are severally placed at Ephesus (this episode includes the famous story of the talking lion whom Paul had baptized, now known to have formed part of the original work), at Philippi, at Corinth, on the last journey to Rome (conceived as starting from Corinth), and lastly at Rome itself. The last three pages are from the previously known story of the martyrdom.

The new material warrants conclusions of considerable importance. In the first place Schmidt's previous contention that the Coptic fragments which he edited in 1905 are from a true translation of the original *Acts* is amply confirmed; further Dr Schubart shows that parallels in style and vocabulary establish the claim of the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* to be a part of the original work; and—most interesting of all—the narration of an appearance of Christ to the Apostle on his voyage to Rome affords proof, as Schmidt convincingly argues, that the *Acts of Paul* are later than and dependent on the *Acts of Peter*, and not *vice versa*. Now the *Acts of Paul* cannot be later than the last decade of the second century and the *Acts of Peter* may now be probably assigned to the decade 180-190 A.D.

Photographic reproductions of the eleven pages of the papyrus and a facsimile of page 8 complete this fascinating work.

J. M. CREED.

St. John's College, Cambridge.

Papyri Osloenses. Fasc. III. Edited by S. EITREM and L. AMUNDSEN. Pp. xi+326, and (in a separate cover) 12 collotype plates. Oslo: Dybwad, 1936. Paper.

THERE is no need to repeat here what has been said in praise of the production and English of POSlo. by the reviewers of Fasc. I (C.R. xl, 1926, 26) and II (xlv, 1932, 23). Fasc. III (65-200) contains seven literary texts, edited by Amundsen. Except 71, all are from the *Iliad* and did not deserve printing in full with a commentary; but 71, a long papyrus of Isocrates *Panegyricus* (Plate: 1st-2nd cent.), has considerable importance. The circumstance that, like PRoss. Georg. 15 of Herodotus, it shows divergences from the MS. order which involve hiatus, indicates a

possible source of corruptions; while in several places¹ a comparison with the contemporary POxy. 844 proves that some of the variants over which our *Urbina*s and the other MSS. part company already existed in Alexandrine times.

There follow five interesting fragments on medicine, astronomy and magic (72-76). But the bulk of the volume consists of seventy-one public and private documents (77-147) and fifteen private letters (148-162), followed by horoscopes and smaller fragments, literary and non-literary. The volume, which contains nothing earlier than the first or later than the fourth century, concludes with eight pages of corrections to all three fascicules and the usual indices.

Of most general interest amongst the documents will be the Calendar of Festivals, 77, which shows that in provincial emperor-worship under Marcus Aurelius the Flavii and Ulpia still received a full measure of commemoration side by side with events connected with the reigning dynasty, such as the *vicennalia* of Hadrian or the birthday of L. Aelius Verus. 78 provides a third copy, with fresh supplements, of the edict of Hadrian in 136 A.D., distributing a bad year's tribute over the five next; and 79 is an almost contemporaneous edict of the governor Petronius Mamertinus dealing with liturgies.

J. ENOCH POWELL.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

Stephen MACKENNA: *Journal and Letters*. Edited with a Memoir by E. R. Dodds. Pp. xvii+330; 4 illustrations. London: Constable, 1936. Cloth, 18s.

STEPHEN MACKENNA, having failed in English in the Intermediate Examination of London University, never had a University education. Yet he lived to produce one of the greatest of English translations from the Classics. To all the classical scholars who were not personally acquainted with him, he was and remains a tantalizingly interesting figure. For them above all Professor Dodds has done a great service by the publication of this book.

It is not just that MacKenna had a romantic and varied life. As we read this book, we are not chiefly interested to hear of his fighting for the Greeks against the Turks, or of his alleged sweeping of restaurants in New York, or even of his investigating, as special correspondent, the first Russian Revolution. We are interested more in the inner life of MacKenna, for whom all such events were merely incidental. It is very clear why MacKenna was drawn to the study of Plotinus.

Such a man, like Plotinus himself, does not lend himself to the writing of a formal biography. Professor Dodds has wisely confined himself to a short memoir, for the rest allowing MacKenna, in his journal and letters, to speak for himself. The memoir is excellent, making full use of the scanty material available and nowhere going

¹ § 20 (44d) ἀμφισβητεῖ τῆς ἀρχῆς Urb., POxy. m. 2—ἀ. περὶ τ. ἀ. vulg., POxy. m. 1, POSlo. (false, due to gloss); § 34 (47c) εἰρεῖν ἐχομεν Urb., POSlo—ἐχομεν εἰρεῖν vulg., POxy.; cf. § 33 (47b) πρὸς τὰς τέχνας POxy. m. 1, POSlo—πρὸς τε τ. τ. MSS., POxy. m. 2.

beyond it. One point which, though not essentially relevant to a life of MacKenna, might have been treated more fully is the motives of Sir Ernest Debenham in patronizing MacKenna's Plotinus.

Anyone who is interested in neoplatonism, ancient or modern, or in modern developments in Ireland, or in humanity itself, should certainly read this book.

M. J. BOYD.

Queen's University, Belfast.

WALDE-HOFMANN: *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 9. Lieferung. Heidelberg: Winter, 1936. Paper, M. 1.15.

This part of Walde-Hofmann, like its predecessors, is practically a new work, and those interested in the etymology of the Latin language cannot be too grateful to Hofmann not only for his amazing erudition but also for the extreme care with which he has carried out his task. It begins with *heres* and continues to *is*, and where the previous edition had thirty pages the present requires eighty. A most useful addition is the great number of words which are borrowed from Greek and other languages and which then developed inside Latin. The new words, including such borrowings, which are discussed in this part are *heus*, *hippacare*, *hippagines*, *Hispania*, *historia*, *homeltium*, *hosa*, *hyacinthus*, *hyaena*, *hysex*, *tacca*, *iberts*, *ibex*, *ibis*, *ida*, *idiota*, *idurio*, *legius*, *ileus*, *illa*, *imbractarium*, *imbubino*, *imbulbito*, *impaestator*, *impendum*, *impetigo*, *impilia*, *ina*, *inaures*, *incarduum*, *inchoris*, *incilega*, *incom*, *indolis*, *indrutico*, *ingrusia*, *interanea*, *interpolo*, *intervallum*, *intrio*, *intubus*, *Inuus*, *ipsilles*, *irrumo*. Apart from the great increase of illustrative examples from other languages and an exhaustive classification of formal developments in Latin, definite etymological advances beyond the range of the second edition can be found in the articles upon *hilum*, *honos*, *horeia*, *hostis*, *hostia*, *idoneus*, *ignis*, *ignosco*, *ilicet*, *imber*, *impancro*, *impero*, *impetrare*, *impomenta*, *impraesentiarum*, *inanis*, *inciens*, *incilare*, *incohatus*, *indulgeo*, *indusium*, *ingens*, *inmusulus*, *insilia*, *intro*, *invito*, *involo*. Thus *ignosco* is now derived from *enu-gnō-scō and compared with Skt. *anu-jñā*, while *indusium* because of the quantity of the root-vowel is separated from *induo*. Brugmann derived *impraesentiarum* from *in praesentia harum* without explaining the ellipse of *rerum*; Hofmann now restores Corsen's *in praesentia rerum*. *incilare* is now given as a denominative verb from *incile*, and *ingens* is explained as a parallel formation to *iners*. If one may single out a few articles for special mention because of their fullness, the articles on *hodie*, *homo*, *hornus*, *tacio*, *imber*, *indiges*, *inquam* are excellent.

P. S. NOBLE.

University of Leeds.

H. KORNHARDT: *Exemplum. Eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Studie*. Pp. viii+95. Diss. phil. Göttingen, 1936. Paper.

THAT the usages of *exemplum* fall into two different sets, one of which goes back to the primary meaning 'sample of an inarticulate mass (e.g. grain)', while the other derives from

'model, sample of a series of manufactured articles (e.g. pots)', is a proposition which, cleverly though it is presented, fails to convince me. Sample as (1) representing a certain quality, (2) embodying a *desired* quality would be a more likely division, both meanings originating from the same *Grundsituation* of the merchant 'taking out' a sample and exhibiting it to the customer. Fortunately, although a different arrangement of the usages discussed in the first three chapters would thus be necessary, the value of the present study is hardly impaired by the course adopted. Dealing e.g. with *exempla virtutum*,¹ *exempla* in education, *Strafexempel*² and others, Miss K. draws an interesting picture of Roman life and Roman ideas, with a keen eye for the cultural background and a firm grasp of facts. There is a welcome aloofness from the precarious statements not uncommon in this kind of monograph, with the single exception of a passage on the individual personality as a model for imitation, where more than is necessary seems to be ascribed to Greek influence. Without doing injustice to the other parts of the book I should like to earmark as particularly good the discussion of *exempla* in Public, Sacred and Civil Law. But a possibility, considered on p. 85, that these *exempla* might have a *Grundsituation* of their own does not exist: the peculiar formation of *exemplum* as denoting the result of an action makes it unlikely that it should have been formed twice. Indeed, Miss K.'s remark (p. 1) that the word 'konnte spontan von jedem Lateinsprechenden überall gebildet . . . werden' is a flaw in an otherwise subtle and informative introductory chapter concerned with primary and secondary meanings.

The title proves a good omen; a happy combination of ingenuity and common sense, depth of understanding and lucidity of exposition makes this treatise an example for similar studies.

OTTO SKUTSCH.

St. Andrews.

P. SATTLER and G. v. SELLE: *Bibliographie zur Geschichte der Schrift bis in das Jahr 1930*. Pp. xx+234. (Archiv für Bibliographie, Beiheft 17.) Linz a.D.: Verlag 'Im Buchladen', 1935. Paper.

THIS work originated in the 'bibliographische Uebungen' directed by Professor Frick of Göttingen. Completed, it contains a well-ordered inventory of works on the known scripts of the whole world. The present reviewer has

¹ Like A. W. Lichfield, *National exempla virtutis in Roman literature*, Harv. Stud. 25 (1914), a study not referred to, Miss K. calls them *exempla virtutis*, although she knows it to be wrong.

² A plausible explanation is offered, and aptly illustrated by an amusing collection of parallels from modern languages, for the development of expressions like *exemplis pessumis exorari*. Here a more lexicographical presentation would have shown that the singular is never used, a fact surely of some semasiological significance.

tested it for the scripts of the Eastern Mediterranean and found but few omissions. Occasionally titles have misled the professional bibliographers into overlooking such important works as A. Deimel's *Sumerisches Lexicon* (Rome, 1930-33), Ch. Fossey's *Manuel d'Assyriologie* (Paris, 1926), and W. Wright's *Empire of the Hittites* (London, 1884: one of the pioneer attempts at decipherment of the Hittite script). Thomas Young's *Hieroglyphs* (London, 1823-28) deserves mention as one of the most important stepping-stones in the history of the decipherment of Egyptian hieroglyphs. It is difficult to account for the absence of G. Howard's *Clavis Cuneorum* (Leipzig, 1904-33). On the Aegean scripts one misses references to the relevant passages in Ed. Meyer's *Gesch. d. Altertums* and in H. Pedersen's *Linguistic Science in the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 141 ff. K. Meister's *Homerische Kunstsprache* (Leipzig, 1921) discusses the history of the Semitic aspirate signs (pp. 221 ff.). On Cyprian reference might have been made to Deeke's bibliographies in Bursian XI, XIX and XXVIII, and to the relevant paragraphs in A. Thumb's *Handbuch der griech. Dialekte* (pp. 285 ff.). But in a work of such a kind it would be miraculous if there were no omissions, and thanks are due to the authors for their painstaking compilation, which will be a valuable *Hilfsmittel* to all who are interested in the history of writing.

L. R. PALMER.

University of Manchester.

Roman Alpine Routes. By W. W. HYDE (Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. II.) Pp. xvi+248; 1 map. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1935. Paper.

THIS treatise is a description, largely from personal observation, of the routes through the Alps which can either be proved or be supposed to have been important for Roman history. The literature of the subject has been combed with thoroughness; and although few, if any, new views are put forward, the work forms a useful compendium of information with a good index. The map is very inadequate for its purpose. Summaries are given of the problem of the Etruscans in North Italy, and of the Celtic infiltrations and invasions; and there is an excursus on Hannibal's pass, in which the author plumps for the Little St. Bernard.

B. L. HALLWARD.

Peterhouse, Cambridge.

Maria Ludwika BERNHARD: *Wazy Greckie w Muzeum Im. E. Majewskiego w Warszawie*. Pp. viii+79; 16 loose plates. Warsaw: Trzaska, Evert i Michalski, 1936. Linen. THE Majewski collection in Warsaw contains one hundred and five pieces. Most of these are of little interest and most are fragments, but the collection boasts a fragment of a pseudo-Chalcidian amphora, an aryballos of Payne's Lion Group, and a good Faliscan skyphos. Miss Bernhard has done her work well in describing and dating all the pieces, and her text is good, as far as a foreigner can judge. She adds a useful résumé in French, describing the collection, noting

where she differs from the Polish volume of the *Corpus Vasorum*, and ending with a short vocabulary of the Polish words most necessary to her readers. Her bibliography contains nothing by Ure since *Black Glaze Pottery* (1913) and omits Jacobsthal's *Ornamente*. Both Jacobsthal and the later works of Ure would have been useful to her. The plates are not very well reproduced and the photographs, except in one case, have had the backgrounds cut out; but they are usable, and reproduce all the objects except about a dozen.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University of Manchester.

Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Great Britain. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum. Fascicule 2. By Winifred LAMB. Pp. 72; 48 plates. London: Milford, 1936. Cloth and boards, 18s.

THE second fascicule of the Cambridge Corpus maintains the high standard set by the first. The vases are admirably reproduced, and of all the important vases details are given as well as general views. Miss Lamb has, unlike so many editors of the Corpus, given us photographs which can really be used for work: notice for instance the care that she has taken over the Clazomenian fragments on plate XIX and the details of black-figure vases on plate XXVIII. The text is excellent: an approximate date is always given, and Miss Lamb is abreast with the latest literature. The only criticisms that can be made are that detailed references to Payne and Johansen would have been useful on Protocorinthian, and to H. A. Thompson, *Hesperia* 1934 pp. 311 ff., on Megarian bowls, and that the section on white-ground vases might have been more fully embellished with literature. These are however minimal points. This fascicule covers a wide range of fabrics: the Fitzwilliam collection proper contains most fabrics, from Cypriote and Cycladic bronze age to the late-Megarian bowls; the Ricketts and Shannon collection, which occupies the last eighteen plates, consists chiefly of Athenian black- and red-figure and white-ground.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University of Manchester.

Krister HANELL: *Zur Diskussion über die Ara Pacis*. Pp. 12; 2 plates. (*Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund* 1935-6, V.) Lund: Gleerup (London: Milford), 1936. Paper, 1s.

THE observations of Löwy and others are now carried further so as to form a still more useful contribution to the understanding of a monument which will occupy a position of prominence at the Augustan bimillennium. The *constitutio*, on 4th July, 13 B.C., could have included no such scene as is suggested by the two long friezes; the *consecratio* and *dedicatio*, on 30th January, 9 B.C., did not require a realistic representation on the monument. Therefore the friezes do not commemorate an actual ceremony, but are symbolic of the dedication: each contains—separated by a slight division—both participants in the religious act and also on-

lookers; the two friezes are not evenly balanced in interest, but the figure of Augustus dominates the whole. The representation is 'a pictorial transcription of the idea of the monument.' In the end panel of Aeneas offering the sow, the temple of the Penates may be the venerable shrine at Lavinium. A. W. VAN BUREN.

American Academy in Rome.

Vincenzo D'AMICO: *Necropoli Arcaica di Tufara Valfortore*. Pp. 22; 4 text cuts. (*Samnium*, VIII, nos. 3-4, Aug.-Dec. 1935.) Benevento: Tipi del Sannio, 1935. Paper.

THIS village is described as lying on an ancient route connecting Samnium and Daunia. In a vineyard several hundred yards distant from the

river Fortore, inhumation graves were found containing equipment in clay, bronze, and iron. After the excavations had been filled in, the writer of the article was invited to examine the yield, which unfortunately had not been kept in separate burial-groups. The small photograph of the ceramics and the 'double axe' does not suggest an early date for either the one or the other; the 'axe' is stated to be of iron, and seems to show a hybrid form; one hesitates to attribute to either this implement or the skull that is published on two other cuts so far-reaching an ethnological significance as is suggested. A scientific exploration of the site, however, might yield results of interest.

A. W. VAN BUREN.

American Academy in Rome.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

DEAR SIRS,

M. Picard's letter to the *C.R.* (p. 43) shows that he misread my review, for I was comparing books by *different* publishers and asking for better pictures, even if fewer. And it seems to me that he has re-read his own words with too little care. I cannot interpret his note on Ahab's House in the sense he now gives it, and while I found his note on the Vaphio cups obscure, the legend of the illustration may justify my statement of his views. His list of museums is *not* restricted to those containing archaic sculpture, and his omission of the Cambridge and Birmingham museums

of casts becomes heinous on the news that he considered them unimportant. His text (p. 522) can scarcely be said to agree with his chronological table about the date of the Selinus metopes. I very much regret that I missed the signs of his own studies of technique, but that is all too easy when they are secluded in footnotes which do not mention his name, as in the instance he quotes. My comments on the style were based on the authority of a French teacher of the language, a graduate of a French University. Finally, I still hold that the setting of the book is unworthy of its matter.

A. W. LAWRENCE.

Queens' College, Cambridge.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

(A reference to *C.R.* denotes a notice already published in the *Classical Review*.)

GNOMON.

XIII. 1. JANUARY, 1937.

The Swedish Cyprus Expedition, Finds and Results of the Excavations in Cyprus 1927-1931 [Stockholm: The Swed. Cyprus Exped. 1935. Part 1, pp. xlv+861, 299 illustrations, 30 maps; Part 2, 250 plates] (Schweitzer). Sch. summarizes the results at length and finds them worthy of high praise. *Die antiken Münzen Nord-Griechenlands*. Vol. 3: *Makedonia und Paionia* by H. Gaebler [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1935. Pp. viii+234, 40 plates 4°] (Kubitschek). Monumental work, though some conclusions are not acceptable. A. Ernout and A. Meillet: *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine* [*C.R.* XLVI, 133] (Leumann). Might be better in some respects, but gains by being less abstract than such works usually are. W. Theiler: *Das Musengedicht des Horaz* [*C.R.* L, 203] (Klingner). Often suggestive, though much is questionable. 1. H. A. Sanders: *A Third-century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul* [*C.R.* XLIX, 241]; 2. F. G. Kenyon: *Recent*

development in the textual criticism of the Greek Bible [London: Milford, 1933. Pp. 119]; 3. A. Rahlfs: *Septuaginta* [Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935. Pp. 2177]; 4. Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake: *Six collations of New Testament manuscripts* [Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1932. Pp. viii+243, 7 plates]; 5. S. C. E. Legg: *Evangelium secundum Marcum* [*C.R.* XLIX, 206] (v. Soden). v. S. mentions the main points of interest in 1. and 2. 3. is well executed; 4. represents useful work, though the collations are unfortunately founded on the texts of different editions. 5. is very welcome in spite of some mistakes and omissions. W. R. Ridington: *The Minoan-Mycenaean Background of Greek Athletics* [*C.R.* L, 241] (Nilsson). R. does not bring the problem much nearer to a solution. Ch. Liedmeier: *Plutarchus biographie van Aemilius Paullus. Historische commentaar* [*C.R.* L, 139] (Gelzer). A full and good edition. There is a welcome French summary of the principal conclusions.—Obituary notices of Paul Wolters by H. Bulle and of Otto Immisch by A. Körte.

XIII. 2. FEBRUARY, 1937.

J. D. Denniston: *The Greek Particles* [C.R. XLVIII, 221] (Zucker). A very useful book. Scholars may not agree with D.'s interpretations in all of his many examples (Z. contributes a few rival interpretations), but the collection of material is invaluable. N. Valmin: *Rapport préliminaire de l'expédition en Messénie 1934* [C.R. L, 39] (Klaffenbach). K. summarizes the principal discoveries. A. Gotschich: *Probleme der frühgriechischen Plastik* [C.R. L, 81] (Müller). There are some good observations, but G.'s main contentions cannot be accepted. H. Riemann: *Zum griechischen Peripteraltempel* [Düren: Spezial-Dissertations-Buchdruckerei, 1935. Pp. 207] (v. Gerkan). There is much room for objection; but R.'s book is the most important on the subject, and it suggests lines of investigation even if it does not follow them satisfactorily. K. Schefold: *Untersuchungen zu den Kertscher Vasen* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1934. Pp. 162, 50 plates, 85 illustrations 4°] (Watzinger). The principal value lies in the illustrations, which include many unpublished or incompletely published vases. 1. E. B. van Deman: *The Building of the Roman Aqueducts* [Washington: Press of Roberts Compagnie, 1934. Pp. xi+440, 59 plates 4°]; 2. Th. Ashby: *The Aqueducts of Ancient Rome* [C.R. L, 34] (Lugli). These two books say the last word about the construction of the Roman Aqueducts. D. Curschmann: *Griechische Verwaltungsurkunden* [C.R. XLIX, 181] (Kiessling). C. shows real understanding of the difficulties of the texts and is fully able to grasp the legal problems. H. Willrich: *Perikles* [C.R. L, 191] (Miltner). An attractive sketch, but not very satisfactory from the historical point of view. F. Vittinghoff: *Der Staatsfeind in der römischen Kaiserzeit* [Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1936. Pp. 117] (Hohl). Recommended to all who are interested in the law and history of the Roman Empire. M. A. Levi: *La Politica Imperiale di Roma* [Turin: Paravia, 1936. Pp. 299] (Wickert). Unscholarly and useless. H. Eberhart: *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek. 4. Literarische Stücke* [C.R. L, 37] (Schubart). E. deserves thanks for carefully performing a thankless task; the papyri, though apparently useless, may ultimately prove to have value. Πλουτάρχου τῶν ἐπὶ σοφῶν συμπόσιον. Text, translation into modern Greek, and commentary by 'E. Δαυῖδ [Athens: Κολλαρος & Σία, 1936. Pp. 31+114] (Sieveking). A useful edition of the text, though the introduction and notes are too elementary.—Obituary notices of Theodor Wiegand by M. Schede and of Gustav Oberländer by G. Rodenwaldt.—Bibliographical Supplement 1937 Nr. 1 (down to January 31).

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(DECEMBER, 1936.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—*Antimachi Colophonii reliquiae*. Collegit, disposuit, explicavit B. Wyss [Berlin, 1936, Weidmann. Pp. lxxiv+

106] (E. Kalinka). Excellent edition; completely satisfies all justifiable demands.—C. M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry from Alcman to Simonides* [C.R. L, 168] (E. Kalinka). Conveys a mass of new instruction in a very tasteful manner; learned and arresting book.—J. Geffcken, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*. Bd. 2. [C.R. XLVIII, 217] (E. Müller-Graupa). Brilliant performance.

PHILOSOPHY.—E. Hoffmann, *Platonismus und Mystik im Altertum*. Sitz.-ber. d. Heidelberger Ak. d. Wiss. 1934-35, Abh. 2 [Heidelberg, 1935, Winter. Pp. 168, with 2 plates] (H. Leisegang). Development sketched down to Proclus and Boethius; many new points of view and pertinent observations.

LANGUAGE.—H. Widmann, *Beiträge zur Syntax Epikurs* [Stuttgart, 1935, Kohlhammer. Pp. xv+266] (R. Philippson). Most industrious and conscientious work; of value for history of Greek and welcome aid to research on Epicurus.—W. Schulz, *Indogermanen und Germanen* [Leipzig, 1936, Teubner. Pp. 104, with 93 figures] (H. Philipp). Both easily intelligible and of scientific value. Not the last word on the subject, but undoubtedly one of the best and clearest guides to the difficult problem of the Indogermanization of Europe.

PAPYROLOGY.—E. Bernecker, *Die Sondergerichtsbarkeit im griechischen Recht Ägyptens*. Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrussforschung, Heft 22 [Munich, 1935, Beck. Pp. 195] (K. F. W. Schmidt). This excellent book is indispensable for those working on the relevant papyri.—E. J. Goodspeed and E. C. Colwell, *A Greek Papyrus Reader* [C.R. L, 148] (K. F. W. Schmidt). Intended to make language of New Testament intelligible to theological students with small knowledge of Greek; serviceable selection.

ARCHAEOLOGY.—W. Dörpfeld, *Alt-Olympia*. 2 vols. [Berlin, 1935, Mittler and Son. Pp. 501, with 86 figures and 24 plates] (G. Lippold). In some important points a definite advance as compared with the earlier excavations. But not all parts of the book are equally convincing.

COMMUNICATIONS.—Dec. 12, A. Schramm, *Der Molenbau in Vitruvius Architectura* (4 cols.). Dec. 26, L. Früchtel, *Nachweisungen zu Fragmentsammlungen* (3 cols.).

(JANUARY—MARCH, 1937, NOS. 1-12.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—H. Färber, *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike* [Munich, 1936, pp. xiii+80+68] (E. Kalinka). A comprehensive work on the theory of Lyric, which fills an important gap; F. shows sound judgment and salutary caution; reviewer makes some criticisms of detail and notes some omissions.—H. Kesters, *De authenticiteit van den Kleitophon* [Philologische Studien, Tijdschrift voor classieke philologie, 1934-5, pp. 31] (A. Kraemer). K. holds the *Kleitophon* to be a genuine Platonic work, a reply to Antisthenes περί διαλεκτικής. Reviewer gives detailed summary.—W. Nestle, *Aristoteles Hauptwerke* [Leipzig, n.d., pp. lix+410] (R. Philippson). Resembles N.'s earlier volume of selected passages in transla-

tion; introduction careful, translation sound, but selecting makes for obscurity and sometimes actually misleads.—J. Braune, *Nonnos und Ovid* [C.R. L, 239] (F. Lenz). B. is unacquainted with some of the literature of his subject. Reviewer outlines his theory, which he suggests has some plausibility.—E. Kalinka, *Die Dichtungen Homers* [Vienna 1934, pp. 26] (S. Lorenz). K. returns to the old view that the Iliad and Odyssey were by the same hand. R. G. Bury, *Sextus Empiricus II* [C.R. XLIX, 225] (R. Philippson). Reviewer notes some points of disagreement, but in general approves both text and translation.—C. Hude, *Xenophon, Memorabilia* [C.R. XLIX, 90] (K. A. Eichenberg). A solid, careful edition, which will form the basis of further critical work for many years to come.—K. Jost, *Das Beispiel und Vorbild der Vorfahren bei den attischen Rednern und Geschichtsschreibern bis Demosthenes* [C.R. L, 177] (C. Rüger). Long review, giving detailed analysis; the book shows deep learning and is a valuable contribution to the history of Greek rhetoric; the chapters on Isocrates and Demosthenes have been developed into a kind of literary portrait; a work of special interest for modern Germans, whose ethical values so resemble those of the Greeks.—J. Seewald, *Untersuchungen zu Stil und Komposition der Aischyleischen Tragödie* [Greifswald 1936, pp. 62] (W. Morel). Severely criticized, but the author is more successful in the second part of the book, where he deals with individual scenes from the point of view of symmetry.—J. H. Vince, *Demosthenes II* [C.R. L, 175] (C. Rüger). Reviewer discusses numerous textual points, and criticizes weaknesses in translation.

LATIN LITERATURE.—G. Funaioli, *Horas als Mensch und Dichter* [C.R. L, 239] (R. Helm). Shows understanding, insight and deep feeling, and is a notable contribution to Horatian studies.—P. Ercole, *Studi Giovenaliani* [C.R. L, 95] (R. Helm). An introductory volume; reviewer disagrees sharply with E.'s views on the chronology of the satires.—J. Wight Duff and A. M. Duff, *Minor Latin Poets* [C.R. XLIX, 78] (A. Klotz). Translation satisfactory, though occasionally wrong; text generally reasonable (reviewer criticizes some details); apparatus criticus often clumsily arranged.—W. Aly, *Livius und Ennius von römischer Art* [C.R. L, 202] (A. Klotz). Unconvincing argument, frequently based on very slight evidence.—R. Till, *Sueton, Cäsarenleben* [Leipzig 1936, pp. xxxv + 509, M. 4.50] (C. Hosius). Reviewer criticizes T.'s translation, which is apt to be careless and loose.—Halm-Andresen-Köstermann, *Tacitus II, 1* [C.R. L, 180] (A. Gudeman). Reviewer notes a number of attractive conjectures made by K., though few are admitted to the text; he adds some points where he is in disagreement.—C. I. M. I. van Beek, *Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis, I* [C.R. L, 241] (O. Stählin). A careful and reliable foundation for the discussion in Vol. II of the problems involved in the *Acta*. Reviewer criticizes some orthographical details.—E. V. Marmorale, *Petronio* [C.R. L, 227] (R. Helm).

Rather unconvincing.—P. van de Woestijne, *Rutilius Claudius Namatianus* [Antwerp 1936, pp. 103] (R. Helm). A neatly printed, carefully compiled edition; the text is conservative, giving little new help at notorious cruxes; the double apparatus unpractical and confusing; valuable *index verborum*.—Xp. K. Karpoukayias, *Tà πρὸ τῶν τῶν Τρωϊδῶν τοῦ Λ. Annaei Senecae* [C.R. L, 95] (C. Hosius). K. is mainly concerned with the Latin sources, the *Aeneid*, Ovid, Horace, Lucretius; he is often too enthusiastic, and mistakes coincidence for borrowing.—H. Reuschel, *Episches im Moretum und Culex* [Diss. Markkleeberg 1935, pp. 108] (F. Lenz). In spite of a tendency to be diffuse, R. has done some useful work; reviewer gives analysis in some detail.—N. Eriksson, *Religiositet och Irreligiositet hos Tacitus* [C.R. L, 91] (A. Gudeman). E. is no more successful than others in solving or explaining away the difficulties of interpreting Tacitus' religious feeling from his own words; but his work, which is exhaustive and unprejudiced, ought not to be neglected by anyone attracted to the subject. Reviewer develops his own theories in an interesting essay.—J. de Jong, *Apologietiek en christendom in den Octavius van Minucius Felix* [C.R. L, 39] (A. Kraemer). Long notice, with detailed analysis.

HISTORY.—J. Gagé, *Res gestae divi Augusti* [Publ. de la faculté des lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, 1935; pp. 213; 25 fr.] (E. Kornemann). A valuable edition, making full use of all the available material; it does honour to French scholarship. Reviewer propounds his own chronological theory of the composition of the *Monumentum*.—H. Rudolph, *Stadt und Staat im römischen Italien* [C.R. XLIX, 235] (F. Geyer). A valuable piece of research; reviewer summarizes the book in some detail.—C. E. Goodfellow, *Roman Citizenship* [C.R. L, 141] (E. Hohl). A useful work, showing industry and judgment; reviewer corrects a few points.

ARCHAEOLOGY, ART AND ANTIQUITIES.—J. Chamonard, *Les mosaïques de la maison des masques* [Exploration archéologique de Délos, fasc. xiv; Paris 1933] (G. Lippold). Important new evidence for Hellenistic mosaic work in Delos and for the type of house built there.—H. Swoboda, J. Keil, F. Knoll, *Denkmäler aus Lykaonien, Pamphylien und Isaurien* [Brünn 1935, M. 22] (F. Hiller von Gaertringen). Reviewer welcomes the new evidence made available by this important book.—D. Curschmann, *Griechische Verwaltungsurkunden (Papyri Iandanae, fasc. vii)* [C.R. XLIX, 181] (K. F. W. Schmidt). A solid first production by the editor, which deserves many successors. Reviewer gives some account of contents, and makes some suggestions.—*The Annual of the British School at Athens*, XXXIII (1932-3) (G. Lippold). Account of contents.—E. Langlotz, *Griechische Vasen in Würzburg* [Munich 1932] (P. Mingazzini). A sumptuous catalogue. Reviewer has much criticism of the arrangement of the text, and of the dating and attribution of some of the vases.—A. W. Van Buren, *Ancient Rome as revealed by recent discoveries* [C.R. L, 190] (J. Sieveking). A kaleidoscopic

work, with no unity of theme, too desultory for a guide-book, too intimate for a scientific introduction, yet capable of arousing interest.—R. C. Flickinger, *The Greek Theater* [Chicago 1936, 4th edn., 5 dollars] (C. Fensterbusch). A reprint of the 2nd and 3rd editions, with a short new appendix dealing with recent research (reviewer notes omissions). The book is not a purely scientific production, being primarily intended for readers with little or no knowledge of classical literature. Reviewer criticizes F.'s account of the development of the theatre buildings in the 6th and 5th centuries.—E. Pastor, *Olympische Spiele der Vorzeit* [Berlin 1936, pp. 72, M. 3] (H. Philipp). A useful piece of work; reviewer praises a number of points.—G. E. Rizzo, *Monumenti della pittura antica scoperti in Italia*, III, fasc. i, ii [Rome 1936] (J. Sieveking). Long expository notice of this exceedingly valuable work.

LANGUAGE.—B. Bondesson, *De sonis et formis titulorum Milesiorum Didymaeorumque* [C.R. LI, 46] (Bror Olsson). A careful and useful dissertation, strongly to be recommended to epigraphists and philologists. B. concludes that before 400 B.C. the written language of Miletus was characteristically Ionian, but that from then onwards an Attic influence can be traced, and here as elsewhere we find a koine with a slight local colouring.—F. W. König, *Die Stele von Xanthos, I (Metrik und Inhalt)* [Vienna 1936, pp. 152, 18 schill.] (J. Friedrich). Useful criticism impossible until the second volume appears. K. generally shows much skill and good sense, but at times his imagination carries him away in his anxiety to get as much as possible from his material. K. is the first to examine critically the metrical part of the inscription; in the 2nd part he attempts to emend the Lycian script. A long philological review, not always favourable to K.'s methods, which are often unsound.—Liddell and Scott, *Greek Lexicon*, revised edn., part 8 [C.R. XLIX, 226] (W. Schmid). Very long notice, in two parts, continuing method adopted in 1926 and 1934; list of omissions, etc., divided into nine sub-headings.—G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, II (εἰρήνη—ἡχέω) [Stuttgart 1935, pp. 401-958, subscription price M. 2.90] (E. Nestle). Warmly welcomed as worthy of its predecessors.

NEW TESTAMENT.—S. C. E. Legg, *Novum Testamentum Graece, Ev. sec. Marcum* [C.R. XLIX, 206] (P. Thomsen). An admirable piece of work, and a very valuable contribution to New Testament scholarship.

MISCELLANEOUS.—G. Mercati, *Per la storia dei manoscritti greci di Genova, di varie badie d'Italia e di Patmo* [Vatican City 1935, pp. xii+360] (B. Dölger). Very highly praised; an invaluable study not only of the history of libraries and of MSS., but also of the whole cultural history of the 6th and 7th centuries; indispensable to the student of Greek MSS., especially those in Italy.—*Africa Romana* [C.R. L, 142] (E. Ziebarth). Favourable review; the essays of Grazioli, Momigliano and Guidi are specially praised.—L. Herrmann, *Die Golgotha am Palatin* [Brussels 1934, pp.

205, Fr. 25] (F. Taeger). Dismissed as quite unsound and fantastic.—*Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire orientales*, III [Brussels 1935, pp. viii+684] (P. Thomsen). The majority of the essays in this volume, compiled in honour of M. Jean Capart, naturally deal with Egyptology. Reviewer briefly mentions the chief papers, and strongly recommends careful study; he draws attention to E. Honigsmann's account of published or forthcoming works on Byzantine Geography. Many beautiful plates.—G. Stadtmüller, *Eine griechische Uebersetzung des italienischen Apokalypsenkommentars von Federigo da Venezia O.P.* [Leipzig 1936, pp. 55, M. 4.80] (B. Bischoff). An interesting and skilful piece of research.—R. Schaerer, *Ἐνωτήριον et Τέχνη* [Macon 1930, pp. xii+221] (W. Nestle). S. is unacquainted with some important studies bearing on his subject, and he does not deal exhaustively enough with the pre-Platonic period.—L. Laurand, *Pour mieux comprendre l'antiquité classique* [C.R. L, 159] (J. K. Schönberger). A collection of 32 essays from French and Belgian periodicals. Highly praised; a book by L. needs no further commendation.—*Der Grosse Brockhaus*, vols. XIII-XV, MUE-ROB [Leipzig 1932-3] (F. Poland). An account of the range of these three volumes.—W. Gundel, *Neue astrologische Texte des Hermes Trismegistus* [Munich 1936, pp. vii+378] (A. Scherer). B.M. MS. Harleianus 3731 (1431 A.D.), published in this volume, provides rich material for the history of ancient religion and culture, including a hitherto unknown system of astrological geography. The book contains a word-index of Latin and old French which should prove a mine of interest to linguists.—W. Krause, *Die Kelten und ihre geistige Haltung* [Königsberg 1936, pp. 47] (W. Ensslin). A book of stimulating ideals which are worth attention; reviewer makes some criticisms.—G. Pasquali, *Pagine meno stravaganti* [Florence 1935, pp. vi+238, L. 15] (F. Lenz). A collection of 16 essays on very divergent topics, showing much charm—a 'frater minor' to P.'s earlier *Pagine stravaganti di un filologo*.—J. C. Bolkestein, *Ὅσιος ἐν Εὐσεβίῃ* [C.R. L, 157] (A. Kraemer). A careful, thorough investigation of these terms. Reviewer summarizes B.'s conclusions in a long analytical notice.

COMMUNICATIONS.—2 Jan., J. K. Schönberger, Notes on Cic. *Vat.* 10, Corn. Nep. XV. 4. 6, Horace *S.* I. 1. 62, *Epp.* I. 1. 16, 18, Petron. 79. 10, Aeschylus *Ag.* 36. 9 Jan., I. Hopfner, *Hispania punisch-baskisch-keltisch?* 23 Jan., A. Kurfess, Note on Sallust *Jug.* 78. 2. 30 Jan., A. Kurfess, *Zur Declamatio in L. Sergium Catilinam.* 6 Feb., A. Giusti, *Herodotea* (7. 224, 8. 84, 8. 86). 20 Feb., L. Weber, *Lectiones Herodoteae* (2. 116 ff., 3. 57 f., 4. 120, 5. 16, 7. 116, 8. 108)—with reference to J. E. Powell in *C.Q.* XXIX, 72 ff., 150 ff. 27 Feb., P. Thielscher, Note on καλῇ in Aristophanes *Nub.* 989, 1018. 6 March, A. Schwarz, *Verkannte Stellen bei Plautus* (*Rudens* 704, *Capit.* 888, with ref. also to *Curc.* 129, *Asin.* 910). 20 March, F. Walter, *Zu Livius und Iustinus* (textual notes on a number of passages).

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY.

VOL. XXX, NOS. 7-8. DECEMBER, 1936.

REVIEWS. J. Geffcken, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte II. Von Demokritos bis Aristoteles*, Heidelberg, 1934. An unusual volume, valuable for its solid contents and originality. (J. Hammer). A. O. Lovejoy and G. Boas, *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity*, Baltimore, 1935. Will long remain the great source-book on the subject: admirable skill and scholarship (G. D. Hadzits). E. R. Dodds, *Proclus, the Elements of Theology*, Oxford, 1933. Masterly and important work (F. A. Spencer). T. A. Sinclair, *A History of Classical Greek Literature from Homer to Aristotle*, Macmillan, 1935. Favourable (Id.). D. M. Robinson, *Pindar, a Poet of Eternal Ideas*, Baltimore, 1936. Despite pointless digressions and parallels many pages are pleasant reading (G. Tyler). A. Gudeman, *Aristoteles Poetik*, Berlin and Leipzig, 1934. Corrections and annotations reveal the great scholar and critic (H. Edmiston). G. M. A. Grube, *Plato's Thought*, London, 1935. A large and clarifying study (Alice E. Braunlich). T. W. Allen, W. R. Halliday, and E. E. Sikes, *The Homeric Hymns*, 2nd ed., Oxford, 1936. Far superior to edition of 1904: should have a fuller apparatus (G. E. Duckworth). H. A. Sanders, *A Third-Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul*, Ann Arbor, 1935, and Sir F. G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, London, 1936. Notices by F. A. Spencer. R. H. Barrow, *A Selection of Latin Inscriptions*, Oxford, 1934. Favourable (C. W. Keyes). R. P. Robinson, *The Germania of Tacitus: a critical edition*, Middletown, Conn. 1935. Exhaustive account of MSS. and extensive apparatus (J. A. Kerns). F. P. Donnelly, S. J., *Cicero's Milo, a Rhetorical Commentary*, New York, 1935. Designed for the Jesuit ratio studiorum, but useful for rhetorical technicalities (J. Stinchcomb). Alina Chodaczek, *De Prisciani Lydi Solutionum Capite VI*, Lwów, 1936. Secures a few fairly important results for the reconstruction of Posidonius (W. A. Oldfather). E. T. Silk, *Saeculi Noni Auctoris in Boetii Consolationem Philosophiae Commentarius*, Amer. Acad. Rome, 1935. Favourable (K. M. Abbott). M. L. W. Laistner, *A History of the Greek World from 479 to 323 B.C.*, London, 1936. Most of the historical judgments eminently sane (W. W. Hyde). A. C. Johnson, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome. II Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian*, Baltimore, 1936. In general good expositions of the état des questions, but several conclusions and interpretations questionable (N. Lewis). R. Carpenter, A. Bon and A. W. Parsons, *Corinth III Part II. The Defences of Acrocorinth and the Lower Town*, Harvard, 1936. Summary by A. D. Fraser. F. W. Goudy, *The Capitals from the Trajan Column at Rome*, Oxford, 1936. Close study of lettering by a master of type design (Anon.). Joyce O. Hertzler, *The Social Thought of the Ancient Civilizations*,

New York, 1936. Of some value as a source-book for readings in the ancient history of the Near East (Anon.). E. Gilson, *The Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy*, New York, 1936. Sympathetic survey of mediaeval metaphysics (Anon.).

NOS. 9-18. JANUARY-MARCH, 1937.

(10) *Announcing a new department.* The series 'Classical Articles in Non-Classical Periodicals' ceases (with no. 11) and is replaced by 'Abstracts of Articles', summarizing 21 classical and parts of some non-classical periodicals (Nos. 13 ff.).

(12) W. H. Alexander, *The Amiable Tyranny of Peisistratus, or the Future of Classical Studies*. Proposes study of classics in translations as better suited than linguistic scholarship to modern 'popularized education'.

(17) E. Riess, *Some Remarks on 'The Future of the Classics'*. Criticizes study of classics in translations; advocates linguistic courses even of short duration.

REVIEWS. (9)—Cameron, *History of Early Iran* [C.R. LI, 23] (Rostovtzeff). Very favourable. Hadas and McLean, *The Plays of Euripides* [C.R. LI, 47] (H. S. Dawson). First volume of a prose translation in excellent English; conservative, scholarly, but not Euripides. Préaux, *Les ostraca grecs de la collection Charles-Edwin Wilbour au Musée de Brooklyn* [C.R. XLIX, 163] (N. Lewis). Mostly tax-receipts of familiar types; well annotated. Charlesworth, *Five Men. Character Studies from the Roman Empire* [C.R. LI, 46] (R. Marcus). Contains much profit and diversion. Carrington, *Pompeii* [C.R. LI] (M. E. Blake). An effective résumé. Webster, *An Introduction to Sophocles* [C.R. L, 171] (F. R. B. Godolphin). Valuable on style and plot-construction; unsatisfactory on thought and character. Allan, *Aristotelis de Caelo Libri Quattuor* [C.R. LI, 15] (I. E. Drabkin). Supersedes all previous texts. Rupprecht, *Cosmae et Damiani, Sanctorum Medicorum, Vita et Miracula (e Codice Londinensi)* [pp. 82. Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1935] (J. P. Pritchard). Creditably edited, and must henceforth be used with Deubner's standard edition. Moore, *The Roman's World* [C.R. LI, 96] (W. C. Greene). Highly praised. Winter, *Life and Letters in the Papyri* [C.R. XLIX, 72] (R. C. Horn). Valuable. Roberts, *Two Biblical Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester* [pp. 62, 2 plates. Manchester U.P. 1936.] (E. H. Kase). Fragment of Deuteronomy (dated 2nd century B.C.) and of 4th century A.D. testimony book. Fyfe, *Hellenistic Architecture* [C.R. L, 189] (D. M. Robinson). Of extreme value; many details criticized. Horne and Smith, *Quintilian on Education* [pp. viii, 260. New York Univ. Book Store Press, 1936] (M. E. Hutchinson). Translated selections, with discussion, for students of education. Waddell, *The Desert Fathers*. (Translations with introduction) [pp. xi, 297. New York, Holt, 1936.] Skilfully chosen. Shewan, *Homeric Essays* [C.R. L, 13]. Valuable.

(10) Parker, *A History of the Roman World from A.D. 138 to 337* [C.R. L, 194] (E. L. Hettich). At his best on administration; inad-

quate on economics and religion. Reviewer prefers methods of Mommsen and Rostovtzeff with this difficult period. Bossert and Zschietzschmann, *Hellas and Rome. The Civilization of Classical Antiquity* [pp. lxii, 320 plates. New York: E. Weyhe, 1936] (S. N. Deane). Handy collection of half-tones illustrating ancient life.

(11) Pease, *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus* [C.R. L., 226] (H. R. Fairclough). Voluminous erudition; inadequate on verse-technique. Robinson, *A Short History of Greece* [C.R. L., 229] (C. J. Kraemer, Jr.). On the whole, sound and up-to-date; but too much journalism. Flickinger, *The Greek Theater and Its Drama*, 4th edition [pp. xxviii, 385. Chicago U.P. 1936] (A. Gudeman). Bibliography not brought up to date; G.'s commentary on Aristotle's *Poetics* deliberately ignored. Meyerstein, *The Elegies of Propertius* (C.R. L., 73) (J. V. Cunningham). Misinterprets P. as a poet of fragments; vitiated by a false notion of the poetic. Willing, *Der Geist Spartas* [pp. x, 160. Berlin, 1935] (M. Hadas). Selected passages from ancient authors with comments enforcing the ideal of *Führertum*. Dornseiff, *Die Archaische Mythenzählung* [C.R. XLVIII, 60] (F. L. Clark). Brilliant but not always convincing.

(12) Gow, A. E. Housman, *A Sketch* [C.R. LI, 80] (K. P. Harrington). Admirable biography, lists and indexes. Many of Housman's emendations will not stand the test of time. Liddell-Scott-Jones, *A Greek Lexicon* Part 9 [C.R. LI, 34] (C. W. Keyes). A great task; compression makes the work slightly less convenient in use. Hadzits, *Lucretius and His Influence* [C.R. L., 37] (J. B. Stearns). Highly praised; reviewer suggests some additions.

(13) (1) Buchmann, *Die Stellung des Menon in der platonischen Philosophie* [C.R. L., 207]. (2) Hardie, *A Study in Plato* [C.R. LI, 67] (L. A. Post). (1) A thorough study placing *Meno* at beginning of P.'s middle period. (2) Stimulating but unconvincing. Wilbour, *Travels in Egypt 1880-1891*, ed. J. Capart [pp. xvi, 615. Brooklyn Museum, 1936] (C. J. Kraemer, Jr.). Letters of a genial and distinguished American Egyptologist. Schubart and Schmidt, *Acta Pauli nach dem Papyrus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek* [C.R. LI, 85] (H. A. Sanders). Fragments printed, translated, annotated; with brief 'Untersuchungen'. Groag and Stein, *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*, saec. I, II, III: pars II [pp. xxxii, 399. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1936] (M. L. W. Laistner). Instalment (letter C) of much extended new edition; a model of exact scholarship. Cobban, *Senate and Provinces*, 78-49 B.C. [C.R. L., 33] (E. L. Hettich). Competent and useful; some points questionable. Dörpfeld, *Alt-Olympia* [pp. 481 (2 vols.), 86 illustrations, 38 plates, 24 plans. Berlin: Mittler, 1935] (A. S. Cooley). Results of excavations 1906-1930 minutely described by D. and colleagues. Marsh and Leon, *Tacitus, Selections* [C.R. L., 240] (A. Gudeman). Criticizes many details and editors' adverse view of T. as historian. Stanford, *Greek Metaphor* [C.R. LI, 70] (A. E. Kober). Lucid and charming; some sections provoking as well as provocative.

Nierhaus, *Strophe und Inhalt im pindarischen Epinikion* [pp. 123. Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1936] (G. Tyler). Sane and helpful.

(14) Smith, *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum* [C.R. L., 242] (E. H. Dohan). Raymond, *Orosius, Seven Books of History Against the Pagans*, Translated with introduction and notes [pp. xi, 436. Columbia U.P., 1936] (R. M. Geer). Worthless (except for VII). Koster, *Traité de métrique grecque* [C.R. LI, 79] (H. Fränkel). Helpful, in spite of defects. Gomperz, *Briefe und Aufzeichnungen* (ed. H. Gomperz, Band I [pp. vii, 480, 14 plates. Vienna: Gerold, 1935] (E. Riess). Interesting selections with running comment. McCrea, *Literature and Liberalism, with other Classical Papers* [pp. x, 218. Columbia U.P., 1936] (D. M. Robathan). Delightful essays. Scott, *We Would Know Jesus* [pp. 176. New York: Abingdon, 1936] (J. A. Kleist). Uses both biblical and non-biblical sources; praised. Semenov, *The Greek Language in its Evolution* [C.R. L., 183] (J. A. Kerns). Antiquated and uncritical. Bozzi, *Ideali e Correnti Letterarie nell'Eneide* [C.R. L., 88] (G. E. Duckworth). Of value; tends to obscure artistic unity. Korfmaier, *Othloni Libellus Proverbiorum* [C.R. LI, 47] (J. Hutton). Revised text with reliable introduction and notes. Goodspeed and Colwell, *A Greek Papyrus Reader* [C.R. L., 148] (F. W. Gingrich). Praised. Cozzo, *Il Luogo Primitivo di Roma* [pp. 199. Rome: Cremonese, 1935] (G. McCracken). Thesis that Rome began as a market plausible; some of the evidence adduced is weak.

(15) Mattingly and Sydenham, *The Roman Imperial Coinage* vol. IV pt. 1 *Pertinax to Geta* [pp. xv, 406, 16 plates. London: Spink, 1936] (E. T. Newell). Well up to standard set by its predecessors. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry* [C.R. L., 168] (L. R. Van Hook). Criticism in general unfavourable. Scholarly treatment but too detailed and elaborate. (1) Eissfeldt, *Philister und Phönizier* [pp. 42. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1936]. (2) Alt, *Völker und Staaten Syriens im frühen Altertum* [pp. 39. *Ibid.*] (E. L. Hettich). Authoritative and up-to-date brochures of the series 'Der alte Orient'. (1) Quinn, *Horace: Odes, Epodes and Art of Poetry*. In English verse [St. Louis, 1936]. (2) Van Gundy, *The Odes of Q. Horatius Flaccus*. Translated into English verse in Horatian metres [C.R. L., 225] (F. M. Carey). (1) Attractive volume of smooth verses. (2) Constantly violates elementary principles of civilized English. Moore, *The Story of Instruction: The Beginning* [pp. 380. Macmillan, 1936] (W. L. Carr). Education in Sparta, Athens, Macedon, Rome. Praised. Ducati, *La Scultura Greca*, 6 fascicles [pp. 64 each. Florence, 1936] (H. N. Fowler). 565 half-tones (fairly good) with brief, fairly accurate descriptions and discussions. Durling, *Georgic Tradition in English Poetry* [pp. 259. Columbia U.P., 1935] (H. A. Watt). Careful discussion of Virgilian imitations. Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique appliquée au latin* [C.R. L., 70] (H. Caplan). Achieves its aims with clarity and good judgment; some details are criticized. Hyde, *Roman Alpine Routes* [C.R. LI, 87]

(A. Diller). Reliable, attractive, but not very original, account. De Veau, *The Bucolics of Vergil* [pp. xxiii, 220. Oxford U.P., 1934] (A. G. C. Maitland). Excellent edition for school or college. Mascle, *Le Djebel Druze* [Beyrouth, 1936]. A valuable guide-book.

(16) Lumby, *Cook's Traveller's Handbook to Palestine, Syria and Iraq* [6th ed., pp. 496. London: Simpkin, Marshall, 1934]. Up-to-date guide-book; misleading on travel conditions. Vellay, *Controverses autour de Troie* [C.R. L, 246] (J. P. Harland). Further arguments for Bali-Dagh as site of ancient Troy; indecisive on main point, successful on others. Buschor, *Die Plastik der Griechen* [pp. 123, 100 illustrations. Berlin: Rembrandt-Verlag, 1936] (K. Lehmann-Hartleben). Condensed text with generally excellent illustrations. Hurd, *The Topography of Punic Carthage* [pp. xii, 65. Williamsport, Pa., 1934] (W. E. Gwatkin). Impressively argued. Nicol, *The Historical and Geographical Sources Used by Silius Italicus* [pp. 179. Oxford: Blackwell, 1936] (H. M. Poterat). Accurate and comprehensive. Walz, *Der Lysianische Epitaphios* [C.R. I.I, 83] (E. L. Highbarger). Thorough argumentation for genuineness of the speech; vocabulary might be studied in greater detail. Ziegler, *Titus Pomponius Atticus als Politiker* (pp. 124. New York: Stuyvesant Press, 1936) (M. Reinhold). A major contribution to the still unwritten definitive biography. Laurand, *Pour mieux comprendre l'antiquité classique* [C.R. L, 159] (M. Walburg). Essays of great interest and variety. Chevallier-Vérel, *Sculptures du Musée de l'Acropole* [pp. 6, 34 plates. Paris: Editions Louis Carré, 1936] (M. Bieber). Excellent plates. Sullivan, *Maphei Vegii Laudensis De Educatione Liberiorum IV-VI* [C.R. LI, 48] (J. Hutton). Millikan, Merriam, Shapley, Breasted, *Time and Its Mysteries* [pp. viii, 102, 6 plates. New York U.P., 1936]. Four fascinating lectures on time and its measurement.

(17) Geist, *Pompeianische Wandinschriften* [pp. 105. Munich: Heimeran 1936] (H. H.

Tanzer). 400 graffiti with German translation. Pöschl, *Römischer Staat und griechisches Staatsdenken bei Cicero* [C.R. LI, 96] (C. W. Keyes). Ignores *De Legibus*. Vittinghoff, *Der Staatsfeind in der römischen Kaiserzeit* [pp. 117. Berlin, 1936] (K. Scott). Excellent contribution to knowledge of law and ruler-cult. Constans, *Cicéron, Correspondance, tome 3* [C.R. LI, 47] (C. M. Hall). Very useful. Harmon, *Lucian, V* [C.R. LI, 68] (J. P. Pritchard). Felicitous translation with painstaking discussion of parallels.

(18) Youtie, *Tax Rolls from Karanis*, Part I Text. Edited with collaboration of V. B. Schuman, O. M. Pearl [pp. xvi, 437. 4 pl. Michigan Papyri IV, 1, 1936] (H. C. Youtie). 'Review' consists of notes and explanations by the editor. Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*, XVII. 1 (C. J. Kraemer, Jr.). Contents classified and listed. Becker, *Platons Gesetze und das griechische Familienrecht* [pp. xvi, 363. Munich: Beck, 1932] (F. A. Spencer). A pioneer work showing that Plato in general follows the outlines of actual Greek law. Highly praised. Badareu, *L'individuel chez Aristote* [pp. 156. Paris: Boivin, 1936] (F. Solmsen). Unfavourable. Fowler, *Plutarch, Moralia X* [C.R. LI, 47] (F. R. B. Godolphin). Useful text, satisfactory translation, helpful notes with few errors. Hofmann, *Lateinische Umgangssprache*, 2nd edition [C.R. LI, 47] (R. G. Kent). Reprint with 30 added pages of brief items. Reviewer criticizes assumption that colloquial speech is primarily emotional. Sundwall, *Altäretische Urkundenstudien* [pp. 45. Abo, 1936] (A. E. Kober). On the Minoan inscriptions. Kourouniotes, *Eleusis* [pp. 127. Athens, 1936] (J. Johnson). Admirable guide-book (in English). Perry, *Studies in the Text History of the Life and Fables of Aesop* [C.R. LI, 48] (W. G. Waddell). Valuable. Lamb, *Excavations at Thermi in Lesbos* [C.R. L, 232] (H. Goldman). Praised. Grosskinsky, *Das Programm des Thukydides* [C.R. L, 174] (J. A. O. Larsen). L. inclined to disagree with G.'s conclusion.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

. Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Allen (B. M.) Augustus Caesar. Pp. xii + 261; frontispiece and genealogical table. London: Macmillan, 1937. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

Barcay-Amant (Z.) The Hoard of Komin (Antoniniani of the 3rd Century A.D.) Pp. 15; 63 plates. (Dissertationes Pannonicae, Series 2, No. 5.) Budapest: Institute of Numismatics and Archaeology of the P. Pázmány University (Leipzig: Harrassowitz), 1937. Paper, Pengö 25.

Barkan (I.) Capital Punishment in Ancient Athens. Pp. ii + 82. Chicago: University of Chicago Libraries, 1936. Paper.

Bell (H. I.) Recent Discoveries of Biblical

Papyri. Pp. 30. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937. Paper, 2s.

Berve (H.) Miltiades, Studien zur Geschichte des Mannes und seiner Zeit. Pp. vii + 101. (Hermes: Einzelschriften, Heft 2.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1937. Paper, M. 9.

Bickel (E.) Lehrbuch der Geschichte der römischen Literatur. Pp. xii + 587. (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, 8.) Heidelberg: Winter, 1937. Paper, RM. 26 (bound, 29.50).

Bouchery (H. F.) Themistius in Libanius' Brieven. Critische uitgave van 52 brieven, voorzien van een historisch commentaar en

- tekstverklarende nota's. Met een voorrede van J. Bidez. Pp. 295. Antwerp: 'De Sikkel', 1936. Paper.
- Brake (J.)** Wirtschaften und Charakter in der antiken Bildung. Eine Untersuchung über das antike Element in der Wirtschaftsauffassung der deutschen Bildungsgeschichte. Pp. 151. Frankfurt a.M.: Schulte-Bulmke, 1935. Paper, RM. 6.50.
- Büchner (K.)** Beobachtungen über Vers und Gedankengang bei Lukrez. Pp. viii+126. (Hermes: Einzelschriften, Heft 1.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1936. Paper, M. 10.
- Campbell (D. J.)** C. Plini Secundi Naturalis Historiae liber secundus. Pp. 108. Aberdeen: University Press, 1936. Cloth, 5s.
- Carlsson (G.)** Eine Denkschrift an Caesar über den Staat historisch-philologisch untersucht. Pp. 131. (Skrifter utgivna av Vetenskaps-Societeten i Lund. 19.) Lund: Gleerup, 1936. Paper, kr. 6.
- Carver (P. L.)** The Comedy of Acolastus. Translated from the Latin of Fullonius by J. Palsgrave. Edited, with an introduction and notes, by P. L. C. Pp. civ+312. London: Milford (for the Early English Text Society), 1937. Cloth, 20s.
- Classical Studies presented to Edward Capps** on his seventieth birthday. Pp. xii+389: portrait. Princeton: University Press (London: Milford), 1936. Cloth, 22s. 6d.
- Clementi (Sir C.)** Perigilium Veneris. The Vigil of Venus. Edited with Facsimiles . . . , an Introduction, Translation, Apparatus Criticus, Bibliography, and Explanatory Notes. Third Edition. Pp. xi+269. Blackwell, 1936. Cloth, 10s. 6d.
- Cornford (F. M.)** Plato's Cosmology. The *Timaeus* of Plato translated with a running commentary. Pp. xviii+376. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1937. Cloth, 10s.
- Corpus Medicorum Graecorum.** V 10, 2. I. Galeni in Hippocratis Epidemiarum librum III edidit E. Wenkebach. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1936. Export prices: paper, RM. 10.20; bound, 15.60.
- Cutt (T.)** Meter and Diction in Catullus' Hendecasyllabics. Pp. iii+67. Chicago: University of Chicago Libraries, 1936. Paper.
- d'Amico (V.)** Gli aruspici in rapporto alla questione etrusca. Pp. 22. Campobasso: Petrucciani, A. xv. Paper, L. 2.
- Daux (G.)** Delphes au II^e et au I^{er} Siècle. Pp. iii+745; 8 figures, 5 plates. (Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, Fasc. 140.) Paris: de Boccard, 1936. Paper.
- De Ruyt (F.)** Etudes de symbolisme funéraire. Pp. 143+185; 18 figures. Les études anciennes en Italie. Pp. 233-276. Extraits du *Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome*, Fasc. XVII. Brussels and Rome, 1936. Paper.
- Diller (A.)** Race Mixture among the Greeks before Alexander. Pp. 187. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. XX, Nos. 1-2.) Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1937. Paper, \$2.50 (cloth, 3).
- Dirlmeier (F.)** Die Oikeiosis-Lehre Theophrasts. Pp. 100. (Philologus, Supplementband XXX, Heft 1.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1937. Paper, M. 5.80 (bound, 7.30).
- European Civilisation, Its Origin and Development.** By various contributors, under the direction of E. Eyre. In 7 volumes. V. Economic history of Europe since the Reformation. Pp. 1328; 2 maps. London: Milford, 1937. Cloth, 25s.
- Fiedler (H. G.)** A Contemporary of Shakespeare on Phonetics and on the Pronunciation of English and Latin. Pp. 21. London: Milford, 1936. Paper, 3s.
- Gelzer (K. I.)** Die Schrift vom Staate der Athener. Pp. 134. (Hermes: Einzelschriften, Heft 3.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1937. Paper, M. 10.
- Gomme (A. W.)** Essays in Greek History and Literature. Pp. viii+298; 2 maps. Oxford: Blackwell, 1937. Cloth, 15s.
- Graf (A.)** Uebersicht der antiken Geographie von Pannonien. Pp. 156; map. (Dissertationes Pannonicae, Ser. I. Fasc. 5.) Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1936. Paper, Pengö 15.
- Griffin (N. E.)** Guido de Columnis: Historia Destructionis Troiae. Edited by N. E. G. Pp. xvii+293. Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1936. Cloth, \$4 post free.
- H.D. Euripides Ion** translated with notes. Pp. xi+132. London: Chatto and Windus, 1937. Cloth, 6s.
- Hagendahl (H.)** La prose métrique d'Arnobe. Contributions à la connaissance de la prose littéraire de l'Empire. Pp. xi+265. (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift XLII, 1936: 1.) Göteborg: Wettergren och Kerber, 1937. Paper, Kr. 10.
- Hanfmann (G.)** Altetruskische Plastik I. Die menschliche Gestalt in der Rundplastik bis zum Ausgang der orientalisierenden Kunst. Pp. xii+135. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1936. Paper.
- Haspels (C. H. E.)** Attic Black-figured Lekythoi. Pp. x+407, and portfolio of 54 plates. (Ecole Française d'Athènes, Travaux et Mémoires . . . , Fasc. IV.) Paris: de Boccard, 1936. Cloth and boards.
- Hesperia.** Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Vol. V: No. 4. Pp. 443-520; figures and plates. Athens: American School of Classical Studies, 1936. Paper.
- Hüttl (W.)** Antoninus Pius. Erster Band. Pp. 470. Prag: Calve, 1937. Paper, Kr. 150.
- Istituto di Studi Romani.** Orazio nella letteratura mondiale. Scritti di E. Castle, A. Forström, N. J. Herescu, J. Huszti, J. Marouzeau, R. Newald, W. Norvin, L. Pietrobono, C. C. Riba, L. Sternbach, A. W. Van Buren, H. Wagenvoort, H. M. O. White. Pp. 253. Rome: Istituto di Studi Romani, 1936. Paper, L. 20.
- James (D. G.)** Scepticism and Poetry: an essay on the poetic imagination. Pp. 275. London: Allen and Unwin, 1937. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- Kahrstedt (U.)** Untersuchungen zur Magistratur in Athen. Pp. 330. Stuttgart and Berlin: Kohlhammer, 1936. Paper, RM. 21.

- Klassieke Bibliographie*. 8e Jaargang, 1936. Utrecht, 1937. Boards.
- Knight* (W. F. J.) Cumaeae Gates. A reference of the Sixth *Aeneid* to Initiation Pattern. Pp. xv + 190; 14 figures. Oxford: Blackwell, 1936. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Korfmacher* (W. C.) Othloni Libellus Proverbiorum. Recensuit adnotationibusque criticis et illustrativis indice nominum et rerum instruxit G. C. K. Pp. xlii + 132. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1936. Paper, \$2.
- Koster* (A. J.) Plutarchi Vitae Arati edidit, prolegomenis commentarioque instruxit A. J. K. Pp. lxxxviii + 144. Leiden: Brill, 1937. Paper, 6 guilders.
- Kroymann* (J.) Sparta und Messenien. Untersuchungen zur Ueberlieferung der messenischen Kriege. Pp. xxxiv + 115. (Neue Philologische Untersuchungen, 11.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1937. Paper, M. 9.
- Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*. Vol. XIV. Corpus of the Lararia of Pompeii, by G. K. Boyce. Pp. 112; 41 plates. Rome: American Academy, 1937. Paper.
- Meredith* (H. O.) Four Dramas of Euripides: Hecuba, Heracles, Andromache, Orestes: Translated into English Verse. Pp. 253. London: Allen and Unwin, 1937. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Michigan Papyri*, Vol. III. Miscellaneous Papyri, edited by J. G. Winter. Pp. xviii + 390; 7 plates, 3 figures. Vol. IV, Part I. Tax Rolls from Karanis. In 2 volumes. Part I: Text. Edited by H. C. Youtie. Pp. xv + 438; 4 plates. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1936. Cloth, \$5 each.
- Moore* (F. G.) The Roman's World. Pp. 502; illustrations, maps and plans. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1936. Cloth, 18s. 6d.
- Much* (R.) Die Germania des Tacitus erläutert. Pp. xv + 464; map and 26 illustrations. Heidelberg: Winter, 1937. Paper, M. 12 (bound, 14).
- Mynors* (R. A. B.) Cassiodori Senatoris Institutiones. Edited from the Manuscripts. Pp. lvi + 193. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- Nicol* (J.) The Historical and Geographical Sources used by Silius Italicus. Pp. iii + 179. Oxford: Blackwell, 1936. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- Pöschl* (V.) Römischer Staat und griechisches Staatsdenken bei Cicero. Pp. 187. (Neue Deutsche Forschungen.) Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1936. Paper, M. 8.50.
- Riding* (L.) A Trojan Ending. Pp. xxix + 436; 1 map. London: Constable, 1937. Cloth, 8s. 6d.
- Saintonge* (P. F.), *Burgevin* (L. G.), and *Griffith* (H.) Horace. Three Phases of his Influence. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1937. Cloth, 4s. 6d.
- Speiser* (A.) Ein Parmenideskommentar. Studien zur platonischen Dialektik. Pp. 64. Leipzig: Koehler. Paper.
- Steinkopf* (G.) Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Ruhmes bei den Griechen. Pp. 102. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1937. Paper.
- Stella* (S.) M. Tullio Cicerone: Paradoxa Stoicorum. Introduzione e Commento di S. S. Pp. 76. Milan: Signorelli, 1937. Paper, L. 4.
- Stoessl* (F.) Die Trilogie des Aischylos. Formgesetze und Wege der Rekonstruktion. Pp. 264. Baden b. Wien: Rohrer, 1937. Paper, (export price) RM. 27.
- Studies and Documents* edited by K. and S. Lake. V. Family II and the Codex Alexandrinus. By S. Lake. Pp. xi + 158. London: Christophers, 1936. Paper, 15s.
- Studies and Documents*, edited by K. and S. Lake. VII. The Pseudo-Philonian *De Jona*. Part I. The Armenian Text with a Critical Introduction. By H. Lewy. Pp. 49. IX. Ritual and Cults of Pre-Roman Iguvium, with an Appendix giving the Text of the Iguvine Tablets. By I. Rosenzweig. Pp. 152; 1 plan. London: Christophers, 1937. Paper, 7s. 6d. and 15s.
- Syro-Egypt* 1. Pp. 20. London: British School of Egyptian Archaeology (University College, Gower St.), 1937. Paper, half-yearly, 4s. a year.
- Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Epigraphicae*. The Olcott Dictionary of Latin Inscriptions. Vol. II: Fascicles 3 and 4 (audio-augur, augur-avillanlanus). By L. F. Smith, J. H. McLean and C. W. Keyes. Pp. 25-48. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1936. Paper, \$0.75 or 3s. 6d. each.
- Valmin* (N.) Poids préhistoriques grecs de Malthi en Messénie. Pp. 44. (Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund 1936-1937, II.) Lund: Gleerup (London: Milford), 1937. Paper, 2s.
- Way* (A. S.) Catullus and Tibullus in English Verse: pp. 123. The Odes of Horace: a literal translation; pp. 105. The Science of Dining (Mensa philosophica); A Medieval Treatise on the Hygiene of the Table and the Laws of Health; pp. viii + 174. London: Macmillan, 1936. Cloth, 2s. 6d., 2s. 6d., 3s. 6d.
- Weber* (L.) Solon und die Schöpfung der attischen Grabrede. Pp. 188. Frankfurt a.M.: Schulte-Bulmke, 1935. Paper, RM. 10.
- Weter* (W. E.) Encouragement of Literary Production in Greece from Homer to Alexander. Pp. 113. Chicago: University of Chicago Libraries, 1936. (Private Edition.)
- Wiener Studien* LIV. Band 1. und 2. Heft. Pp. 202. Vienna: Oskar Höfels' Witwe, 1936. Paper.
- Wight Duff* (J.) Roman Satire: Its Outlook on Social Life. (Sather Classical Lectures, Vol. XII.) Pp. 205. Cambridge: University Press, 1937. Cloth, 10s. 6d.
- Witt* (R. E.) Albinus and the History of Middle Platonism. Pp. xii + 147. (Cambridge Classical Studies.) Cambridge: University Press, 1937. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Wright* (F. A.) Marcus Agrippa. Pp. xi + 268; frontispiece. London: Routledge, 1937. Cloth, 10s. 6d.
- Zilliacus* (H.) De elocutione Marci Aurelii imperatoris quaestiones syntacticae. Pp. 31. (Societas Scientiarum Fennica. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum. IX. 2.) Helsingfors: Akademische Buchhandlung (Leipzig: Harrassowitz), 1937. Paper, Fmk 12.